



KYUEM KAIGI 2018

Research Pack

POLITICS COUNCIL

Definitions

National Security

National Security refers to the safety of a nation against any threats, foreign or domestic, that may have adverse effects on the wellbeing of the nation. Adverse effects include but are not limited to damage to private and public property and the costs incurred thereof, loss of life or injury, and a compromise of information crucial to the functioning of government. These threats in this council will usually refer to terror attacks with the intention to intimidate, such as suicide attacks, hijackings, bombings and hostage taking. Although terrorism is not the only threat to national security, it is a major one, and is the threat most relevant to the discussions in this council. Therefore, unless delegates choose to define a threat to national security as something else (allowed on the condition it is relevant to the discussion), national security will mean the prevention of terrorism. An example of this would be defining maintaining national security as minimising racial tensions and preventing provocation that would lead to racial unrest. In this example legislation would seek to prevent hate speech by certain individuals.

Civil Liberty

Civil Liberties are the political freedoms that are enjoyed by members of society that restrains its people as far as is necessary to maintain the general welfare of everyone.

Civil Liberty has also commonly been defined as the freedom to live one's life without interference from the government, as the government cannot prevent one from doing what is not illegal. These freedoms are listed below.

The Right to liberty of conscience

The Right to privacy

The Right to habeas corpus

The Right to equal treatment under the law, and due process

The Right to freedom of religion

The Right to travel freely

The Right to freedom of speech

The Right to be free from unreasonable searches and seizures of property

The Right to freedom of the press

The Right to be free from cruel and unusual punishments

The Right to assemble peacefully

The Right to vote

In some situations, as in the Act used as the focus of discussion in this council, the government may find that it is necessary to suspend these liberties. This is usually the case when a person is believed to have committed or been complicit in the execution of, a criminal offense.

Part I - National Security or Civil Liberty, a Malaysian Perspective

The successful government transition on the 9th of May 2018 marked a crucial victory for democracy in Malaysia. While Malaysians celebrate it as one of the most remarkable moments since Independence, democracy is not limited to the power of the people to remove a corrupt leader, and a successful transfer of power. The presence of several laws arguably still restrict the freedom of citizens, while lawmakers claim that national security is their principal concern.



1987. Operation Lalang was initiated by the former and current Prime Minister, Tun Dr Mahathir Mohamad to arrest several political leaders. These leaders included DAP leader Lim Kit Siang and MCA deputy president Lee Kim Sai. They were involved in the Chinese vernacular school issue, while several local newspapers had their publishing licenses revoked. What was remarkable was that all the detainees in Operation Lalang were detained without trial under the Internal Security Act 1960 (ISA).

The Prime Minister claimed that the Operation was inevitable to avoid racial riots that might occur between the Malay and Chinese communities. Although as of 2018 the ISA has been abolished by the former Prime Minister, Dato Seri Najib Razak, the occurrence of incidents like Ops Lalang in the past has highlighted a tendency amongst members of the executive to use laws designed to maintain national security for political reasons.

Although the ISA has been abolished, similar laws still exist, laws that opposition politicians and human rights groups claim still allow the abuse of power in the name of national security to occur. These laws, such as The Security Offences (Special Measures) Act 2010, (SOSMA) which allows detention without trial, is a glaring example of this accusation, a relic of the ISA. The controversy that surrounded the ISA has been claimed by the government to have been prevented as the SOSMA is said to be not applicable to political activists, and has several clauses written into it, to this effect. The SOSMA was said to be a necessary implementation needed by the nation to face the massive threats from terrorism and extremism, which unquestionably threaten the stability of this multiracial nation. However the fact that Maria Chin Abdullah, the president of the Bersih 2.0 movement, was arrested after the Bersih 5.0 rally under SOSMA, shows that anti-terror legislation is still being used by the executive to quash dissent. This incident immediately raised the concern of the masses towards the ability of SOSMA to potentially become tool for the government to eliminate their political opponents. Although it is true that the SOSMA can be and is an effective tool in protecting the nation from destabilising factors, the fact that the law has been used to restrict the political freedom of the citizens should not be ignored.

The inevitable conflict between national security and civil liberty is therefore very real. As it has been shown that the laws designed to protect the nation are used for political means, should we therefore do away with these laws and jeopardise the safety of our country. Or, should these laws be maintained, will liberty be sacrificed to defend national security? A possible compromise would be the introduction of amendments to the laws, to ensure that they cannot be abused for political gain.

Before the independence of the Federation of Malaya, the colonial authorities to face the threat posed by the Malayan Communist Party enacted the Sedition Act 1948. The act disallowed and still prohibits the spread and publication of any information that is defined as “seditious”. After the independence of Malaya and the formation of Malaysia, the Sedition Act was continuously implemented and amended to include more issues as seditious, including questioning the position of the Malay Rulers, the Social Contract and the position of the Bumiputeras. The enactment undeniably saved the nation from communist emergency, racial riots and instability, but as an unwanted consequence the citizens are also restricted from exercising the freedom of speech granted by the Constitution of Malaysia.

Several weeks before the events of the 9th of May, Parliament passed the Anti-Fake News Act 2018 that would allow the imprisonment and other penalties like fines, if convicted. The government legislators argued that the Anti-Fake News Act 2018 was essential to halt the circulations of false information that might harm the reputation of the government and the stability of the country as a whole. Accusing the Act of being too vague and unrestricted in defining “fake news”, political activists claimed that the Act was being used to regulate speech amongst the media and the public. This would allow the government so silence people and publications that criticized its actions, undermining the freedom of speech and tightening the government’s grip on power.

However some parties claim that there is an urgent need for new laws that will enable the government to better protect the nation. In this aspect, the countless anti-terrorism laws are effective in defending the national and maintaining the order. Detention without trial, tapping phone calls, restricting speech are interpreted as necessary means for a greater betterment. Detention without trial would allow potential terrorists to be detained and investigated while under custody, allowing information on their activities to be collected to determine if they are a threat. This would prevent these potential terrorists from fleeing the country should they realise they are being investigated. Wiretapping will enable the security services to monitor, investigate and collect evidence to persecute terrorists. This is the only natural development in the prevention of terrorism, as information is no longer exchanged face to face. Police officers will therefore be able to

break up terrorist cells, and disrupt their networks. Restricting speech can also be deemed a necessary step, as it will prevent extremist preachers from radicalising vulnerable people.

The Lahad Datu incident showed that Malaysia faces a security threat from insurgents on its eastern border with the Philippines. While not exactly religious extremists, the group that arrived in Lahad Datu in 2013 demonstrated that the eastern border was more porous than thought. Given the current situation in the southern Philippines, where an on-going confrontation with various extremist groups has overstretched the Filipino security services, it is quite possible that these extremist groups may make the short hop across the sea to Sabah. The possibility that the Abu Sayaf, the Moro Islamic Liberation Front, or other similar groups may make cross border attacks only highlights the need for new laws to handle this threat. A similar situation exists on the border with Thailand, where the violence in southern Patani might also spill over, exploiting the inability of security services to patrol the entire jungle border. In the past, Malaysia has also faced and continues to face threats from domestic terrorists. The Sauk incident and the conflict against the Al Maunah group is an example of this. Although the Al Maunah group was dealt with and arrested by the security forces, the inability of the police to detect the group's preparations for the attacks, must be seen as a weakness that must be corrected. New laws must therefore be introduced to enable the police to obtain information on potential terrorist attacks.

These measures could be seen as trampling on human rights and personal freedom, but in the eyes of the leaders of the nation, they are a necessary evil in the fight against terror. The argument has also surfaced that these laws will only be used to fight terror, and as such will not affect the average citizen. Law abiding citizens need not worry about being deprived of their civil liberties, as the government will only use these laws to persecute terrorists. Furthermore, some might claim that these measures, although they may seem draconian, are the most effective way to achieve their aims. For instance, some claim that standard legal procedure is simply insufficient to handle a terrorist, a more aggressive form of law has to be formed to ensure effective investigation and

persecution of terrorists, and to protect against potential threats to national security. To summarise the views, national security is always the top priority, thus any kind of measures could be implemented.

However, to those who oppose the idea, legislation without knowing its own boundaries would become a dangerous and disastrous precedent. The liberty granted to the Malaysian citizens by the Constitution of the Federation of Malaysia is restricted under these laws. Their speeches are being watched and supervised, as they could be labelled as “seditious” or “harmful to the national stability” under these laws. Moreover, detention could be imposed on the suspects without being proven as convicted in any courts. All of these laws have one characteristic in common, in which the measures imposed restrict the freedom of the citizens. Thus, these laws could become political weapons to destroy the political weapons, despite being claimed to be essential in defending the national security. The snowball effect should not be ignored, as any legislation that creates loopholes would result in irreversible institutional failures. To conclude, the liberty shouldn’t be forfeited, whereas the political and institutional failures are the real damage that these laws could cause to the nation.

The links below contain relevant information that might be extremely helpful in understanding the issues. It is not necessary to have read all these acts in their entirety, however a quick read of relevant sections would be useful.

1. The Acts

Sedition Act 1948 -

<http://www.agc.gov.my/agcportal/uploads/files/Publications/LOM/EN/Act%2015.pdf>

Security Offences (Special Measures) Act 2012 -

[http://www.agc.gov.my/agcportal/uploads/files/Publications/LOM/EN/Act%20747%20-%20Security%20Offences%20\(Special%20Measures\)%20Act%202012.pdf](http://www.agc.gov.my/agcportal/uploads/files/Publications/LOM/EN/Act%20747%20-%20Security%20Offences%20(Special%20Measures)%20Act%202012.pdf)

Anti- Fake News Law 2018 -

http://www.federalgazette.agc.gov.my/outputaktap/20180411_803_BI_WJW010830%20BI.pdf

National Security Council Act 2016 -

http://www.federalgazette.agc.gov.my/outputaktap/aktaBI_20160607_776-BI.pdf

Internal Security Act 1960

http://www.vertic.org/media/National%20Legislation/Malaysia/MY_Internal_Security_Act.pdf

Prevention of Terrorism Act 2015

[http://www.federalgazette.agc.gov.my/outputaktap/aktaBI_20150604_Act769\(BI\).pdf](http://www.federalgazette.agc.gov.my/outputaktap/aktaBI_20150604_Act769(BI).pdf)

Prevention of Crime Act 1959

<http://www.agc.gov.my/agcportal/uploads/files/Publications/LOM/EN/Prevention%20of%20Crime%20Act%201959%20%5BAct%20297%5D.pdf>

Peaceful Assembly Act 2012

[http://www.federalgazette.agc.gov.my/outputaktap/20120209_736_BI_JW001759%20Act%20736%20\(BI\).pdf](http://www.federalgazette.agc.gov.my/outputaktap/20120209_736_BI_JW001759%20Act%20736%20(BI).pdf)

2. Relevant Debates

Sedition Act

<https://thediplomat.com/2014/09/malaysias-sedition-debate/>

<http://says.com/my/news/peace-and-stability-of-malaysian-at-stake-if-sedition-act-is-abolished-says-ex-igp>

http://www.malaysianbar.org.my/legal/general_news/why_the_sedition_act_stifles_democracy_in_malaysia.html

<https://globalfreedomofexpression.columbia.edu/cases/prosecutor-v-adam-adli-abd-halim-malaysia/>

<https://www.hrw.org/report/2015/10/26/creating-culture-fear/criminalization-peaceful-expression-malaysia>

<https://www.article19.org/data/files/pdfs/analysis/malaysia-sedit.03.pdf>

http://ijbel.com/wp-content/uploads/2015/05/Law1_PAID_IJBEL_journal-IJBEL-vol.-6-Apr-2015_D1.pdf (This essay might be slightly dodgy, especially since they cited Wikipedia, but is still a good attempt at justifying the sedition act)

SOSMA

<http://says.com/my/news/what-is-security-offences-special-measures-act-sosma>

http://www.malaysianbar.org.my/press_statements/press_release_%7C_sosma_must_not_be_abused_to_quell_dissent.html

<https://www.aljazeera.com/indepth/features/2013/12/malaysia-trial-tests-new-security-law-2013122493245600694.html>

<http://www.freemalysiatoday.com/category/nation/2017/07/27/political-arrests-paulsen-disputes-zahids-claim/>

NSC ACT

<https://www.thestar.com.my/news/nation/2016/09/11/better-safe-than-sorry-civil-society-groups-vow-to-continue-questioning-the-constitutionality-of-the/>

<https://www.hrw.org/news/2016/08/02/malaysia-new-law-gives-government-sweeping-powers>

<https://www.aljazeera.com/news/2016/08/malaysia-controversial-national-security-act-launched-160801062824956.html>

ISA

<https://www.economist.com/leaders/2003/06/05/abolish-the-isa>

<https://www.economist.com/asia/2002/11/14/ten-minutes-of-freedom>

<https://harismibrahim.wordpress.com/isa-frequently-asked-questions/>

<https://blog.limkitsiang.com/category/isa/> (Lim Kit Siang as you may well be aware is a politician so take this with a grain of salt.)

POTA

<https://thedi diplomat.com/2015/03/malaysia-debates-new-anti-terror-laws/>

<https://www.hrw.org/news/2015/04/07/hrw-slams-malaysias-new-repressive-anti-terrorism-law>

<http://www.malaysiandigest.com/features/564892-prevention-of-terrorism-act-pota-a-closer-look-at-the-pros-and-cons.html>

Peaceful Assembly

http://www.malaysianbar.org.my/members_opinions_and_comments/the_right_to_peaceful_assembly.html

<https://www.suaram.net/2018/04/27/imposing-peaceful-assembly-act-2012-for-election-campaign-unwarranted-and-undermine-free-and-fair-election/>

Anti Fake News

<https://www.soyacincan.com/2018/04/12/heres-what-you-need-to-know-about-malaysias-new-anti-fake-news-act-2018/>

<https://thedi diplomat.com/2018/04/malaysias-elections-and-the-anti-fake-news-act/>

<https://www.nst.com.my/news/nation/2018/04/356083/anti-fake-news-bill-now-law-nsttv>

<https://aliran.com/civil-society-voices/withdraw-the-anti-fake-news-bill/>

<http://www.utusan.com.my/mobile/rencana/utama/kekang-segera-berita-palsu-1.607558>

<http://www.theborneopost.com/2018/04/06/society-needs-time-to-understand-anti-fake-news-legislation/>

<https://www.themalaysianinsight.com/s/33379> (you would need to sign up to read the full article, but this website provides a different perspective to look at the issue.)

<http://hakam.org.my/wp/tag/detention-without-trial/>

3. Support for the Acts

<http://www.therakyatpost.com/news/2015/10/12/if-one-felt-sosma-can-be-abused-why-support-it-in-the-first-place/>

<http://www.thesundaily.my/news/2018/04/16/pm-anti-fake-news-act-protect-malaysians-security-threat-updated>

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/2013_Lahad_Datu_standoff

<https://thedi diplomat.com/2011/11/does-malaysia-need-isa/>

You may also look at similar crises, such as the Communist Insurgency (Darurat Kedua), Operation Lalang, and the May 13 race riots, to see the justification and rationale behind these acts. Also, if you have a Malaysiakini subscription, it would be useful, but it is not necessary.

Part II - The Global importance of National Security and the fight against terror

In other countries, one of the gravest threats to their national security is terrorism. Terrorism is a very broad term and as such it is first necessary to define it. In this council unless stated otherwise, terrorism will mean the violent actions designed to intimidate, carried out by non-state actors be they private individuals or organisations, in order to fulfil a specific goal (for Al Qaeda this was to drive the United States out of the Middle East and establish an Islamic Caliphate). These actions are usually driven and justified by an extremist ideology (for Al Qaeda, Salafi jihadism). These ideologies represent a departure from the established norm of religion, and are discredited by the vast majority of religious scholars. However, other organisations such as the Irish Republican Army and in the past, the Communist Party, have also been branded terrorists. These organisations were not driven by a religious ideology, but rather by nationalist ideas, in the former and a political cause in the latter. Delegates may choose to use these examples if they feel they are relevant to the discussion.

It has popularly been stated that the war on terror began in 2001, in the aftermath of 9/11. In the early 2000s terrorism was seen in the west as being perpetrated by Al Qaeda and its allies, as part of the "Axis of Evil". The war on terror consisted only of pre-emptive invasions and interventions, and made no effort accommodate the grievances of those locals who were affected by these actions. This resentment against the West, and America in particular, festered, and with the Arab Spring and the rise of ISIS it emerged again as native Arabs saw this new wave of Salafi-Jihadism as an opportunity to rid their homelands of Western disturbances. It was only unfortunate that ISIS was to emerge in the early 2010s, and was thus able to use the Internet to spread its ideologies across the world. As this ideology spread, it inspired young and disenchanted people across the globe to join the fight. The marginalised elements of society saw an opportunity for redemption, and seized it. Often this would lead to them running away from their families, heading to Syria to join the new caliphate, and to devastating lone wolf attacks in own countries. These lone wolf attacks differed from the

traditional method of sleeper cells and a network of contacts, in that a single person acting alone was able to inflict many casualties with simple equipment.

Governments worldwide realised that they were not only fighting a physical enemy, but an ideological one. Tried and tested security measures such as preventive detention, wiretapping and going after sources of funding were simply no longer enough. The war on terror was now online, and governments introduced new laws that were designed to be more effective at combating terrorism. Surveillance of the Internet activity of potential terrorists was seen as a more effective way to identify and prevent possible attacks. This would allow the security services to make arrests pre-emptively, and act before the terrorists. New censorship laws were also put in place to limit the spread of ideologies deemed to have the potential to radicalise. By preventing these ideologies from gaining traction among those in society who could be potential radicalised, these new laws aimed to prevent future attacks.

The need for legislation that is up to date is crucial for the success of the war on terror. The security services cannot act outside the scope of the law, and must be equipped with laws that will enable them to act to prevent these attacks. The intelligence community must also be allowed to collect information vital to combating terrorism. A large percentage of this information now exists on the Internet, as would be terrorist are initially radicalised and later instructed, via online messaging services and the social media. Therefore, the intelligence communities must be authorised by laws to collect this information and cannot be left in the dark.

Below is a list of articles and essays on the need for laws to prevent terrorism. It is hoped that delegates will utilise these in their research. The articles and essays have been arranged by country. Delegates will find that these are a good place to begin their research. The laws mentioned here might only be one of many such laws, and delegates must be careful not to confine themselves to the arguments listed here.

The United Nations

<https://www.un.org/sg/en/content/sg/statement/2017-11-16/secretary-general's-speech-soas-university-london-“counter-terrorism”>

The United Kingdom

- <https://www.theguardian.com/uk-news/2017/jun/04/london-bridge-attack-pushes-theresa-may-into-promising-new-laws>
- <https://www.pri.org/stories/2015-07-15/what-northern-ireland-teaches-us-about-todays-war-terror>
- <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2001/24/contents>
- <https://www.bbc.com/news/uk-40176990>
- https://www.bbc.com/news/uk-43854899?intlink_from_url=https://www.bbc.com/news/topics/cny6gln2vgt/anti-terror-legislation&link_location=live-reporting-story
- <https://www.bbc.com/news/election-2017-40151991>
- <http://www.lse.ac.uk/Research/research-impact-case-studies/aligning-anti-terrorism-laws-criminal-law-human-rights>
- <https://www.dailysabah.com/europe/2018/06/04/uk-government-unveils-new-counter-terrorism-strategy>
- <https://www.economist.com/britain/2017/03/25/britain-suffers-its-worst-terrorist-attack-since-2005>
- <https://www.economist.com/britain/2016/08/20/driving-away-the-shadows>

Indonesia

- <https://www.channelnewsasia.com/news/asia/indonesia-needs-stronger-laws-and-soft-approach-to-fight-terrori-8199162>
- <https://theconversation.com/amp/does-indonesia-need-a-tougher-anti-terrorism-law-85731>

Australia

- <https://www.nsw.gov.au/your-government/the-premier/media-releases-from-the-premier/tough-new-laws-to-combat-terrorism/>
- <https://amp.theguardian.com/australia-news/2017/oct/04/turnbull-defends-proposed-anti-terrorism-laws-as-constitutional>
- <https://www.theaustralian.com.au/national-affairs/tough-new-terror-laws-necessary-to-keep-us-safe/news-story/357274ab4c982e9ecc892c3146250a13>

The United States of America

- <https://www.nytimes.com/roomfordebate/2011/09/07/do-we-still-need-the-patriot-act/the-patriot-act-is-a-vital-weapon-in-fighting-terrorism>
- <http://nationalinterest.org/commentary/defense-the-patriot-act-6102>
- <https://www.economist.com/node/5307629>
- <https://edition.cnn.com/2013/06/10/opinion/sulmasy-nsa-snowden/index.html>
- <http://www.brownpoliticalreview.org/2014/12/the-war-on-terror-does-the-end-justify-the-means/>
- https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/powerpost/wp/2015/11/10/rogan-why-guantanamo-bay-should-stay-open/?noredirect=on&utm_term=.1aad402476b9

- <https://www.nationalreview.com/2015/05/nsa-data-collection-necessary-or-unconstitutional-fred-fleitz/>
- https://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/nsa-intelligence-gathering-programs-keep-us-safe/2014/01/02/0fd51b22-7173-11e3-8b3f-b1666705ca3b_story.html?utm_term=.dd177b788bba
- <http://ahr-ashford.com/the-necessary-discomfort-of-domestic-surveillance-by-nicholas-clarkson/>
- <https://www.nytimes.com/2013/06/19/us/politics/nsa-chief-says-surveillance-has-stopped-dozens-of-plots.html>

Turkey

- http://www.mfa.gov.tr/turkey_s-contributions-to-international-community_s-efforts-to-fight-terrorism.en.mfa
- <https://www.counterextremism.com/countries/turkey>
- <https://www.trtworld.com/turkey/turkish-pm-rules-out-changing-country-s-anti-terror-laws-2689>

Russia

- <https://en.crimerussia.com/gover/putin-justifies-yarovaya-s-anti-terrorism-bill/>
- <https://themoscowtimes.com/news/yarovaya-replies-to-critics-of-new-anti-terrorist-laws-54449>
- <https://meduza.io/en/feature/2016/06/22/irina-yarovaya-s-anti-terrorist-war-on-civil-rights>

Part III - The Universal need to ensure that Civil Liberty is maintained

As governments throughout the world introduce increasingly powerful laws aimed at curbing terrorism and safeguarding national security, human rights groups and those on the opposite side of the political divide are becoming more vocal as to the need for civil liberties to be maintained. Opposition lawmakers often argue that national security need not come at the cost of citizen's rights and interests. In countries where anti-surveillance laws allow governments to collect data concerning their citizen's online activities, questions concerning individual's rights to privacy are brought forward. The opposition to these laws often asserts that there are more effective ways to combat terrorism than limiting individual's rights to information, and to expression and association. A common observation is that to monitor one potential terrorist, the civil rights of tens of thousands of innocent people are also compromised. The accusation that the government is merely using the war on terror as a means to legitimise surveillance and censorship, so it may better control the population, also surface. With the advent of Wikileaks and the actions of whistle-blowers such as Chelsea Manning and Edward Snowden, the extent of the NSA's data collection has become public knowledge. Such accusations bring to mind images of a totalitarian dictatorship, not unlike those found in Orwell's 1984.

These laws also grant the security services the ability to arbitrarily arrest and detain on the suspicion of a terror-related offence. Accusations of racial profiling and guilt by association have also surfaced, contributing to the calls for these laws to be repealed. In China, human rights groups claim that anti-terror laws are being used to systematically cripple the Uighur minority. Their leaders are detained on the premise of supporting terrorism, and their culture destroyed by banning the use of their language in schools, ostensibly to curb extremist thoughts. In China, the threat of terrorism is used to justify the governments campaign to forcibly integrate an ethnic minority into the state.

In other countries where democracy is weaker, anti-terrorism laws are used to silence critics. It is this aspect of anti-terrorism laws that those in opposition to it are cautious

about. In order to successfully combat extremism, the new laws must have a wide scope and as such, are very vague as to which actions exactly constitute a threat to national security. In a healthy democracy these vague definitions are deemed a necessary evil as terrorists constantly adapt and evolve. However in authoritarian regimes and flawed democracies, the anti-terrorism laws are used to stifle free speech, by branding those opposed to the regime as terrorists, when all they are often doing is criticizing the government. It is in this aspect that these laws, legislated purportedly to maintain national security, become a threat to civil liberty. Dissenting journalists are thrown into prison on charges of support of terrorism, aided by preventive detention laws originally designed to break up terrorist cells. Critics are silenced by false accusations of encouraging terrorism. In Erdogan's Turkey and Putin's Russia, governments use these laws to silence dissent, blatantly abusing the law designed for a very different purpose. To these authoritarian governments, terrorism is a useful catch-all in persecuting those deemed to have challenged the authority of the state.

Below is a list of links to articles and papers dealing with Anti-Terrorism Laws in other countries that have been criticised for having the potential for abuse. The articles and essays have been arranged by country. Delegates will find that these are a good place to begin their research. The laws mentioned here might only be one of many such laws, and delegates must be careful not to confine themselves to the arguments listed here. For opposition MPs, the arguments listed here may be of some use in helping them construct arguments of their own.

Highly recommended articles or papers

- http://www.nyu.edu/gsas/dept/politics/faculty/hardin/research/CivLiberties.pdf&ved=2ahUKEwjYu5j4_rHbAhXObX0KHcfRAsgQFjADegQIAxAB&usg=AOvVaw315n4r5e8ikbP7XR PULGpp
- http://www.ohchr.org/Documents/Publications/Factsheet32EN.pdf&ved=0ahUKEwjO9qTG_LHbAhXJdn0KHUVrBS0QFgg3MAU&usg=AOvVaw23ulTiybIlyDZWRIDBFtV0
- <https://www.economist.com/international/2017/07/13/how-powerful-people-use-criminal-defamation-laws-to-silence-their-critics>

The United States of America- the Patriot Act, Edward Snowden and Surveillance,

- <https://www.economist.com/united-states/2015/05/23/reviewing-the-surveillance-state>

- <https://www.economist.com/democracy-in-america/2015/06/02/let-a-little-sunshine-in>
- <https://www.reuters.com/article/us-usa-congress-surveillance/u-s-house-to-vote-to-renew-nsas-internet-surveillance-program-idUSKBN1F01XD>
- <https://www.washingtonpost.com/apps/g/page/world/how-the-nsa-is-tracking-people-right-now/634/?noredirect=on>
- <https://www.google.com/amp/s/techcrunch.com/2018/02/27/warrantless-surveillance-law-proves-its-time-to-take-privacy-into-our-own-hands-2/amp/>
- <https://www.nytimes.com/topic/subject/foreign-intelligence-surveillance-act-fisa>
- <https://www.hrw.org/news/2017/09/14/q-us-warrantless-surveillance-under-section-702-foreign-intelligence-surveillance>
- <https://www.google.com/amp/s/www.independent.co.uk/news/world/americas/us-politics/fisa-what-is-foreign-intelligence-surveillance-act-are-privacy-issues-when-donald-trump-sign-a8168716.html%3famp>
- <https://www.expressvpn.com/internet-privacy/guides/nsa-spying/>

Turkey

- <https://www.amnestyusa.org/turkeys-anti-terrorism-law-tramples-on-human-rights/>
- <https://www.economist.com/europe/2012/03/17/enemies-of-the-state>
- <https://www.universiteitleiden.nl/en/news/2017/03/the-impact-of-anti-terrorism-legislation-on-the-freedom-of-expression-in-france-and-turkey>

Russia, the Yarovaya law and silencing critics

- <https://www.economist.com/the-economist-explains/2016/07/20/why-russias-anti-terrorism-laws-are-controversial>
- <https://themoscowtimes.com/news/russias-big-brother-law-enters-into-force-62066>
- <https://www.hrw.org/report/2017/07/18/online-and-all-fronts/russias-assault-freedom-expression>
- <https://www.nytimes.com/2016/06/25/world/europe/russia-counterterrorism-yarovaya-law.html>
- <https://www.rt.com/politics/349875-putin-signs-fresh-russian-anti/>

Singapore

- <https://www.hrw.org/news/2008/10/17/singapore-end-efforts-silence-opposition>
- <https://www.google.com/amp/s/inform.org/2015/03/26/lee-kuan-yew-and-freedom-of-expression-the-libel-action-as-a-means-of-silencing-political-opposition-tessa-evans/amp/>
- <https://www.google.com/url?sa=t&source=web&rct=j&url=https://digital.law.washington.edu/dspace-law/bitstream/handle/1773.1/1011/20PacRimLPolyJ319.pdf%3Fsequence%3D1&ved=2ahUKEwilj9X077HbAhXJbIsKHcMqDA0QFjAFegQIAxAB&usg=AOvVaw07AacCB7j7TXi uuwhBBLjF>

Link to a PDF on the Negative effects of Terrorism on Human Rights in the Middle East

<https://www.google.com/url?sa=t&source=web&rct=j&url=http://www.ohchr.org/Documents/Issues/RuleOfLaw/NegativeEffectsTerrorism/ADHRB.pdf&ved=2ahUKEwii5NuH67HbAhWJXn0KHT9hB5sQFjAAegQIBB&usg=AOvVaw2m5lwC4-x2aHxpORfCUWEY>

Ethiopia

- https://www.opride.com/2016/01/21/ethiopia-must-stop-use-of-anti-terror-law-to-curtail-legitimate-political-debate-and-dissent/?amp_markup=1

China- the persecution of Uighurs

- <https://www.ft.com/content/f0d3223a-7f4d-11e8-bc55-50daf11b720d>
- <https://www.economist.com/briefing/2018/05/31/china-has-turned-xinjiang-into-a-police-state-like-no-other>
- <https://www.economist.com/analects/2014/07/01/the-net-is-cast>

The European Union

- Early example, may need to translate page to English
https://fr.m.wikipedia.org/wiki/Lois_scel%C3%A9r%C3%A9es
- <https://euobserver.com/justice/136571>
- <https://theconversation.com/amp/inside-emmanuel-macrons-draconian-anti-terrorism-law-83834>

The United Kingdom

- <https://amp.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2006/apr/23/humanrights.constitution>
- quite long..[https://www.lse.ac.uk/humanRights/aboutUs/articlesAndTranscripts/Reflections on civil liberties in an age of counter-terrorism.pdf&ved=2ahUKEwjO9qTGLHbAhXJdn0KHUVrBS0QFjAGegQIABAB&usg=AOvVaw1gxGiPnV8Ln7edyaK0sabV](https://www.lse.ac.uk/humanRights/aboutUs/articlesAndTranscripts/Reflections%20on%20civil%20liberties%20in%20an%20age%20of%20counter-terrorism.pdf&ved=2ahUKEwjO9qTGLHbAhXJdn0KHUVrBS0QFjAGegQIABAB&usg=AOvVaw1gxGiPnV8Ln7edyaK0sabV)
- <http://www.bbc.com/news/election-2017-40181444>
- only a part of this is relevant. not required reading
<http://www.open.edu/openlearn/ocw/mod/oucontent/view.php?id=4537&printable=1>
- <https://www.amnesty.org.uk/press-releases/united-kingdom-anti-terror-proposals-aberration-justice-rule-law-and-human-rights>
- <https://amp.theguardian.com/uk-news/2017/jan/17/uk-counter-terror-laws-most-orwellian-in-europe-says-amnesty>
- <https://uk.mobile.reuters.com/article/amp/idUKKBN151171>

Some thoughts to ponder on

- Should the telephone conversations and online activity of potential terrorists be recorded and stored for analysis?
- Are whistle-blowers like Edward Snowden justified in their actions?
- To what extent should the government regulate online activity?
- Should the security services be given the right to search property of potential terrorists?
- Should the security services be given the ability to carry out arrests without warrants? If yes, in which circumstances would this be permissible?
- What is the most effective way to safeguard national security?
- Is there a potential to abuse laws designed to safeguard national security? Why does this potential exist?
- What safeguards need to be put in place to prevent this?