

*"All that is needed for evil to prosper is for people of good will to do nothing"—Edmund Burke*

# *The Whistle*



**NO. 40, DECEMBER 2004**

**Newsletter of Whistleblowers Australia**

PO Box U129, Wollongong NSW 2500



Bill Toomer, WBA founder member (see back page)

### Secret award for whistleblower

Cameron Stewart  
*Weekend Australian*,  
20-21 November 2004, pp. 1-2

For Australia's newest and most unlikely military hero, it was an extraordinary ceremony that unfolded in the Qantas club lounge of Brisbane airport on Monday.

Nathan Moore, an airfield defence guard with the RAAF, was to be given a citation for his courage in blowing the whistle on drug use in the defence force two years ago.

Moore's actions — which led to him being bashed and his life threatened — had exposed the dark underbelly of drug use in the military, sparking raids at defence bases across the nation and leading to tough new drug laws.

But when the 24-year-old from Queensland's Sunshine Coast turned up to receive his citation, there was not a television camera or journalist in sight.

The Australian Defence Force, which loves nothing better than to parade its heroes in front of the nation, did not want any publicity for this ceremony. What's more, it had instructed Moore not to talk about it.

Moore was the military hero the defence force did not want Australia to know about.

And why? Because defence wanted to avoid any damaging publicity about the explosive case and about its treatment of the young freckle-faced soldier who first exposed drug use at Queensland's Amberley RAAF base in 2002.

Moore's decision to tell his superior officers about drug-taking on the base — including using ecstasy and marijuana during live-fire exercises — very nearly destroyed his life.

Instead of being praised by the RAAF for reporting drug use, Moore was sent back to his unit — where he was bashed and threatened by his colleagues for breaking the military's code of silence.

Recovering from a broken jaw and trauma, he was then transferred to

other RAAF bases, without being given personal protection or specific duties.

He was eventually forced to hide in safe houses up and down Australia's east coast.

Astonishingly, the RAAF then demoted him, citing that his previous promotion was an "administrative error." It then tried unsuccessfully to discharge him.

Eventually, in January this year, Moore had a nervous breakdown and tried to take his own life.

For the past two years, the federal Government has denied it mistreated Moore, with former veterans affairs minister Danna Vale concluding that the RAAF had "acted appropriately under the circumstances."

In July this year *The Weekend Australian* revealed Moore's full story and the fact that the nation's military watchdog, ADF Inspector-General Geoff Earley, had launched an investigation into whether the RAAF gravely mistreated Moore.

Mr Earley said yesterday that he had not yet completed his report into Moore's case because it had proved to be "more complicated" than expected.

However the RAAF last month came to its own conclusion, accepting it had mishandled aspects of his case.

Moore had been treated as a headache rather than a hero by the RAAF. For taking the high moral ground on drug abuse, he had been vilified by colleagues who saw the drug issue as less important than breaking the bond that says you don't squeal on your mates.

So, two weeks ago, on November 6, Air Force Chief Angus Houston decided to deliver some belated justice to Moore by penning a letter of appreciation.

"I wish to acknowledge that you took a courageous step in reporting ... the abuse of illicit drugs during your service," Houston wrote.

"In taking this step you exhibited the values I expect from all members of the air force ... you clearly set an example for all to follow.

"I regret that your actions resulted in considerable stress and personal

injury ... I would like to take this opportunity to formally express my appreciation of you."

Moore declined to discuss his case with *The Weekend Australian*, citing a confidentiality agreement with the RAAF, but defence sources say he was visibly moved when the citation was read out by acting air force chief Air Commodore Ken Birrer at the airport ceremony.

As part of the deal with the RAAF, Moore was discharged from the force on Monday and will be given medical compensation. His demotion was also reversed.

After two years of living a nightmare for doing something he believed was right, Moore now leaves the military as a hero.

But his story is not one the top brass will be re-telling in the history books or on the evening news.

In the pantheon of the Anzacs, it seems not all of our military heroes are equal.

---

### Shameful assault on freedom of speech

Des Houghton  
*Courier-Mail*, 28 August 2004

The Beattie Government has come up with a successful way to silence its critics — it simply bans them from talking to reporters. In a cynical move, charities and social welfare groups have been threatened with funding cuts if they dare to speak out on problems in health, education, housing and family services.

This is repression, of course, and another example of the erosion of free speech in Queensland.

It came to my notice just a week after Premier Peter Beattie patted himself on the back in Parliament, and said his Government was open and accountable.

The full extent of the censorship was exposed last week at a Brisbane conference hosted by the Queensland Council of Social Services.

I gate-crashed the gathering at North Quay, and heard a number of

speakers complain the Government was attempting to stifle debate on issues as widespread as juvenile crime, homelessness and drug abuse.

Not long after the conference began, Shirley Watters, executive director of QCOSS, politely warned speakers that I was in the room taking notes. She specifically urged her colleagues to be wary of criticising the Government while *The Courier-Mail* was listening.

How shameful was that? I have no criticism of Watters here. She was trying to shield her colleagues. What was disturbing was the broad acceptance that anyone who spoke their mind risked government censure.

What has Queensland come to when a group of professionals cannot meet to discuss their problems openly without the fear of government persecution?

Later, Watters admitted that community groups were experiencing heavy censorship in the form of "service agreements" which they must sign before they could get funding.

She said the agreements specifically prohibited groups from speaking to the media.

She spoke cautiously, saying: "We have to walk a fine line."

She declined to elaborate.

One delegate said groups had been punished already for speaking out. Funds had dried up and three-year contracts had been slashed.

"Community agencies need to be able to speak out and point out deficiencies, because many of the people they care for cannot," he said.

"From the Government's point of view it is not only about stopping discussion, it's about media censorship."

Beattie's carpet must be getting lumpy with all the bad news swept under it lately.

Said another delegate: "What they don't want you to hear about is the severe shortage of housing, the hospitals that are closing wards, or that there is a four-year wait for public dentistry or that 14 kids a day are being suspended from school for drugs."

There also was a severe shortage of beds for psychiatric patients who were simply turned out on the streets.

He said the Beattie bans silenced those with the most expertise on the problems.

"While the bans remain there are few to speak on behalf of the mentally ill, the intellectually disabled, prisoners, children at risk, the homeless and those with drug and alcohol problems."

Another social worker said Housing Minister Rob Swarten had quite openly stated at a conference recently that he would not tolerate criticism of the Government.

Swarten had been "explicit and muscling," she said.

Education Minister Anna Bligh's office also had warned community groups not to highlight school drug abuse problems, they said.

When quizzed from the floor of the conference, visiting speaker Linda Hancock, associate professor at Deakin University, said it was "appalling" that state agreements were "trying to stifle advocacy."

She said the Howard Government and the Victorian State Government had similar bans in place.

"There is a real silencing by the Government; a flight from controversy to make it all look good."

A leading Brisbane social worker said: "Fragile organisations reliant on government funding are frightened to criticise."

Queensland Alcohol and Drug Foundation CEO Bob Aldred told the conference he was concerned that the service agreements were prohibiting vital public discussions.

"Can we really be partners (with the State Government) when we can't exercise our democratic rights?" he asked.

---

## **Whistleblowers call for disclosure of government's Iraq deceit** **Daniel Ellsberg and former CIA and FBI officials say Americans need full disclosure of lies, cover-ups, and war's projected costs in lives and dollars**

<http://www.rense.com>,  
20 September 2004

Washington, DC — Daniel Ellsberg, joined today by ten former employees of the FBI, CIA, State and Defense

Departments, issued a call to current government officials to disclose classified information that is being wrongly withheld, about plans for and estimated costs of the war in Iraq, and other documents that contradict government lies.

The "call," in the form of an open memo to current government employees, says "It is time for unauthorized truth-telling." Drawing the clear parallel to Vietnam, the group urges that ongoing silence about government deceptions and cover-ups and reluctance to publicize information about the war's costs and projected casualties carries with it a significant price in human life and national security.

The group released a list of existing documents wrongly withheld within the government as examples of the kind that the public has a right to see (see below). These include background on Army Staff estimates before the war that the Iraq effort would require several hundred thousand troops. Similarly, current estimates of potential casualty rates as the insurgency in Iraq continues to grow as well as the likely cost of waging war over the next few years almost surely exist, and should be disclosed now.

To current government officials, Ellsberg says: "If you have documentary evidence that our country has been lied into an unnecessary, wrongful, endless war — as I had during Vietnam — I urge you to consider doing right now what I wish I had done years earlier than I did: give the truth to Congress and the press, with copies of those documents. The personal costs you risk are great, but you may save many Americans from being lied to death."

Ray McGovern adds: "Truth. Never in the past 50 years has it been in such short supply in the U.S. defense/intelligence community. Yet it is the truth — once known — that will keep us free. Truth-tellers, arise!"

Ellsberg, best known for releasing the Pentagon Papers to Congress and the press in 1971, was joined at a Washington press conference by Ray McGovern, formerly an analyst for 27 years at the CIA, who provided several presidential staffs with their daily morning security briefings; Sibel Edmonds, former FBI translator who was fired for revealing security lapses

at the FBI; and Coleen Rowley, one of *Time* magazine's Persons of the Year as a Whistleblower, currently a Special Agent in the FBI's Minneapolis field office.

The Call and press conference are part of Ellsberg's ongoing work with the Truth Telling Project: <http://www.truthtellingproject.org/>

The conference is also sponsored by the Sam Adams Associates for Integrity in Intelligence, which has given its annual Award to Colleen Rowley and Katharine Gun (who will also be present at the conference) and, last night at American University, to Sibel Edmonds.

Gun, a former translator with the British equivalent of the NSA, was fired after leaking sensitive information to the British press about efforts to "surge" intercept capability against members of the UN Security Council. Gun was acquitted of charges of violating England's Official Secrets Act. Another participant is Major Frank Grevil, of the Danish Intelligence Service, who faces trial for releasing his estimates that revealed lack of evidence of WMDs in Iraq, contradicting his country's involvement in efforts to distort intelligence in order to support the war.

Other signers of the Call — including Mary Ann Wright, who resigned as Deputy Chief of Mission in Mongolia over the war — will also be present, along with Ann Beeson of the ACLU and Beth Daly of the Project on Government Oversight (POGO).

For more information contact: Kawana Lloyd, Jessica Smith, or Steve Smith Fenton Communications (202) 822-5200; <http://www.fenton.com/>

**Call to patriotic whistleblowing of  
Bush Administration's  
widespread corruption**  
The Truth-Telling Project,  
Washington, DC  
20 September 2004

It is time for unauthorized truth-telling. Citizens cannot make informed choices if they do not have the facts — for example, the facts that have been wrongly concealed about the ongoing war in Iraq: the real reasons behind it, the prospective costs in blood and treasure, and the setback it has dealt to efforts to stem terrorism.

Administration deception and

cover-up on these vital matters has so far been all too successful in misleading the public. Many Americans are too young to remember Vietnam. Then, as now, senior government officials did not tell the American people the truth. Now, as then, insiders who know better have kept their silence, as the country was misled into the most serious foreign policy disaster since Vietnam.

Some of you have documentation of wrongly concealed facts and analyses that — if brought to light — would impact heavily on public debate regarding crucial matters of national security, both foreign and domestic. We urge you to provide that information now, both to Congress and, through the media, to the public.

Thanks to our First Amendment, there is in America no broad Official Secrets Act, nor even a statutory basis for the classification system. Only very rarely would it be appropriate to reveal information of the three types whose disclosure has been expressly criminalized by Congress: communications intelligence, nuclear data, and the identity of U.S. intelligence operatives. However, this administration has stretched existing criminal laws to cover other disclosures in ways never contemplated by Congress.

There is a growing network of support for whistleblowers. In particular, for anyone who wishes to know the legal implications of disclosures they may be contemplating, the ACLU stands ready to provide pro bono legal counsel, with lawyer-client privilege. The Project on Government Oversight (POGO) will offer advice on whistleblowing, dissemination and relations with the media.

Needless to say, any unauthorized disclosure that exposes your superiors to embarrassment entails personal risk. Should you be identified as the source, the price could be considerable, including loss of career and possibly even prosecution. Some of us know from experience how difficult it is to countenance such costs. But continued silence brings an even more terrible cost, as our leaders persist in a disastrous course and young Americans come home in coffins or with missing limbs.

This is precisely what happened at this comparable stage in the Vietnam

War. Some of us live with profound regret that we did not at that point expose the administration's dishonesty and perhaps prevent the needless slaughter of 50,000 more American troops and some 2 to 3 million Vietnamese over the next ten years. We know how misplaced loyalty to bosses, agencies, and careers can obscure the higher allegiance all government officials owe the Constitution, the sovereign public, and the young men and women put in harm's way. We urge you to act on those higher loyalties.

A hundred forty thousand young Americans are risking their lives every day in Iraq for dubious purpose. Our country has urgent need of comparable moral courage from its public officials. Truth-telling is a patriotic and effective way to serve the nation. The time for speaking out is now.

**Signatories**

- Edward Costello, Former Special Agent (Counterintelligence), Federal Bureau of Investigation
- Sibel Edmonds, Former Language Specialist, Federal Bureau of Investigation
- Daniel Ellsberg, Former official, U.S. Departments of Defense and State
- John D. Heinberg, Former Economist, Employment and Training Administration, U.S. Department of Labor
- Larry C. Johnson, Former Deputy Director for Anti-Terrorism Assistance, Transportation Security, and Special Operations, Department of State, Office of the Coordinator for Counter Terrorism
- John Brady Kiesling, Former Political Counselor, U.S. Embassy, Athens, Department of State
- David MacMichael, Former Senior Estimates Officer, National Intelligence Council, Central Intelligence Agency
- Ray McGovern, Former Analyst, Central Intelligence Agency
- Philip G. Vargas, Ph.D., J.D., Dir. Privacy & Confidentiality Study, Commission on Federal Paperwork (Author/Director: "The Vargas Report on Government Secrecy"—*censored*)
- Ann Wright, Retired U.S. Army Reserve Colonel and U.S. Foreign Service Officer
- Lt. Col. Karen Kwiatowski,

recently retired from service in the Pentagon's Office of Near East planning

#### Selected signatory biographies

- Daniel Ellsberg is a lecturer, writer and activist on the dangers of the nuclear era and unlawful interventions. He is best known for releasing publicly the *Pentagon Papers*, the 7,000-page Top Secret McNamara study of U.S. decision-making in Vietnam, to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in 1969 and to the *New York Times*, *Washington Post* and 17 other newspapers in 1971.

- Ray McGovern worked for 27 years as a career analyst in the CIA spanning administrations from John F. Kennedy to George H. W. Bush. Ray is now co-director of the Servant Leadership School, which provides training and other support for those seeking ways to be in relationship with the marginalized poor.

In January 2003, Ray, along with other intelligence community alumni/ae, created Veteran Intelligence Professionals for Sanity. Through VIPS, Ray has written and spoken extensively about intelligence-related issues and appeared in several documentaries, notably, *Uncovered: the Whole Truth About the Iraq War* (Robert Greenwald) and *Break the Silence: Truth and Lies in the War on Terror* (John Pilger).

- \* Sibel Edmonds worked as a language specialist for the FBI's Washington Field Office. During her work with the bureau, she discovered and reported serious acts of security breaches, cover-ups, and intentional blocking of intelligence that had national security implications. After she reported these acts to FBI management, she was fired in March 2002.

#### Twelve examples of existing documents that deserve unauthorized disclosure

Each of these — wrongly withheld up till now — could and should be released almost in their entirety, perhaps with minor deletions for genuine security reasons. (In many cases, official promises to release declassified versions have not been honored.)

1. Reports by International

Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) on Guantanamo, Abu Ghrab and other prisons (ships, prisons in other countries) that hold prisoners from the "war on terrorism." (These reports have been provided to the US government but have not been made public.)

2. 28 pages redacted from the report of the Joint House-Senate Inquiry on Intelligence Activities before and after 9/11, concerning the ties between the 9/11 terrorists and the government of Saudi Arabia.

3. 800 pages of the United Nations Report on Weapons of Mass Destruction that were taken by the United States during unauthorized Xeroxing and never given to the Security Council members. (The original report was 1200 pages in length but has never been published in its entirety)

4. Membership, advisors, consultants to Vice President Cheney's Energy Task Force, and any minutes from meetings (January-December, 2001).

5. Documents and photographs concerning/produced by military doctors or medical personnel that document abuses toward prisoners condoned by medical personnel.

6. Documents produced by military lawyers and legal staff that challenge the political policy makers' decision to undercut the Geneva Conventions and any other extra-legal procedures.

7. The missing sections of the U.S. Army General Taguba report on prisons in Iraq and Afghanistan.

8. Department of Justice-Inspector General (DOJ-IG) Report: RE: Sibel Edmonds vs. FBI, completed, classified.

9. DOJ-IG Report: RE: FBI Translation Department (security breaches, intentional mistranslations, espionage charges), completed, classified.

10. DOJ-IG Report: RE: FBI & Foreknowledge of 9/11, completed, classified.

11. Full staff backup to General Shinseki's 2002 estimate that "several hundred thousand troops" would be required for effective occupation of Iraq.

12. The full 2002 State Department studies on requirements for the postwar occupation and restoration of civil government in Iraq.

#### Related links

Project on Government Oversight, <http://www.pogo.org>  
Government Accountability Project, <http://www.whistleblower.org/>  
National Whistleblower Center, <http://www.whistleblowers.org/>  
OpenTheGovernment.org, <http://www.openthegovernment.org/>  
National Security Archive, <http://www.gwu.edu/~nsarchiv/index.html>  
Daniel Ellsberg's Website, <http://www.ellsberg.net>  
Project on Government Secrecy, <http://www.fas.org/sgp/index.html>

---

## The betrayal of the whistle-blowers

Thanks to a glaring legal loophole and a hostile Justice Department, a federal employee who revealed that U.S. nuclear facilities were unsafe found his career and life ruined. And many other whistle-blowers share his fate.

Eric Boehlert

<http://www.salon.com/news/feature/2003/10/21/whistleblower/>

**Oct. 21, 2003** *Time* magazine dubbed 2002 "The Year of the Whistle-blower," honoring inside do-gooders who risked their careers by exposing, among other things, how the FBI let a key terrorism suspect slip through its fingers before the 9/11 attacks and by blowing the lid off Enron's outrageous financial crimes. Since the terror attacks, the critical importance of revealing governmental failures has become obvious: a breakdown in homeland security could mean catastrophe. Indeed, precisely that scenario is laid out in the current issue of *Vanity Fair* [October 2003] which features an exposé about federal whistle-blowers who lay bare the shocking vulnerability of America's nuclear weapons laboratories at Los Alamos to terrorist attack, as well as the ongoing failures of airline and airport security. Several of those same whistle-blowers will soon tell their tale on *60 Minutes*.

In recent years, aided in part by movies like *The Insider*, whistle-blowers have attained the status of folk heroes. "It's become popular to protect whistle-blowers — that's never

happened before,” says Danielle Brian, executive director of the Project on Government Oversight, a nonprofit public interest group dedicated to exposing governmental corruption and mismanagement that works closely with whistle-blowers and that advocates for them.

As a result, most people probably assume that federal whistle-blowers now enjoy strong legal protection against retaliation.

They’re wrong. Many federal whistle-blowers — including the one who exposed the security flaws at U.S. nuclear plants — have had their careers destroyed because of a glaring loophole in the law designed to protect them: If their security clearances are revoked, as frequently happens to whistle-blowers, the special federal agency that investigates their cases has no power to restore it — and the federal appeals court that is their last recourse is a kangaroo court that almost never rules in their favor. Even if a whistle-blower is vindicated, the crucial security status is often not restored — in effect ending a career.

Since the Whistleblower Protection Act, or WPA, was unanimously passed in 1989 (and then strengthened in 1994) to protect whistle-blowers against on-the-job retaliation, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit, the unique court that handles government-contract disputes, has continuously narrowed the rights of whistle-blowers and ruled against them in nearly every case, according to the Government Accountability Project, a public advocacy group.

Experts variously describe what happens to whistle-blowers when they enter the bureaucratic and judicial process as “a Twilight Zone,” “Kafkaesque,” and “Chinese water torture.”

“It’s a big loophole in the law,” says Elaine Kaplan, the former head of the Office of Special Counsel, or OSC, the independent federal agency that investigates whistle-blower cases. “It’s not the most satisfying system.”

New legislation, with bipartisan support in the House and Senate, will attempt to close the loopholes.

“The Whistleblower Protection Act was passed to ensure employees who come forward will be free from harassment for doing the right thing,” says Rep. Todd Platts, R-Pa., who

introduced the new bill in the House of Representatives. “But the court has changed the intent of Congress in such dramatic fashion, to the point where there is significant disincentive for coming forward with information.”

The Department of Justice opposes the bill, calling it unconstitutional. Defending the right of various federal agencies to decide who does and does not get security clearance, the DOJ frames the issue as one of executive-branch power — the president, as head of the government, trumps a personnel arbitration court like the OSC. In the DOJ’s view, security clearance is a privilege, not a right that can be won back in court.

The DOJ and other critics of the pending legislation also argue that many federal employees facing legitimate sanctions would claim they were being punished for whistle-blowing, causing turmoil in the workplace.

“The ease with which Federal employees would be able to establish a prima facie case of whistle-blower reprisal, no matter how frivolous, would seriously impair the ability of Federal managers to effectively and efficiently manage the workforce,” wrote William Moschella, an assistant attorney general, outlining the department’s opposition.

Advocates deride these arguments. They insist that independent review of security clearance rulings is essential because bureaucracies, by their nature, almost always retaliate against whistle-blowers. And they say the DOJ claim that employees would frivolously invoke the law is grossly overstated.

“Historically, the Department of Justice has been hostile to whistle-blowers,” says Brian. “On a simple level, they’re seen as an annoyance, because Justice represents government agencies embarrassed by whistle-blowers. As for frivolous cases clogging the workplace, I’ve been doing this for a long time, and yes, there’s an element of people who call themselves whistle-blowers who have sour grapes. But to suggest that’s a big enough percentage so as to not have actual protection is ridiculous. It’s a red herring.”

Many former and current federal employees who have spoken out say that the system is so rigged against

them that if they were deciding whether to do it again, they wouldn’t.

“What I have learned is, don’t do the right thing — don’t try to protect the American people when you see that they are in danger, because the law won’t protect you,” says Bogdan Dzakovic, a whistle-blower within the FAA who tried to air warnings about lax airline security years before the 9/11 attacks. He considers himself lucky: He’s still got a job with the FAA and collects a government paycheck. But he spends his time doing menial tasks. “My career is over,” he says.

Not every case has ended badly for the whistle-blower. Last year James Hopkins, an international aviation operations specialist with the FAA in Washington, filed for whistle-blower protection after he was fired when he alerted his supervisors to what he believed was a link between one of the hijackers involved in the 9/11 terrorist attacks and someone who had received aviation training at the FAA Academy. Hopkins wanted to take the information to FAA Security and the FBI, but his supervisors told him that “thousands of people were investigating” the attack and he needed to focus on his FAA duties. Hopkins pressed ahead and was fired by his supervisor for his failure to maintain a “calm and professional approach in the completion of duties, as well as evidence of sound judgment.”

Hopkins’ hunch about a 9/11 connection did not turn out to be useful, but the OSC investigated his case, found in his favor, and ordered the FAA to rehire Hopkins. The agency eventually agreed, awarding him full back pay, benefits and attorney’s fees.

Fortunately for Hopkins, his case did not revolve around security clearance. “The Whistleblower Protection Act doesn’t protect people who blow the whistle and then have their security clearance yanked,” Kaplan explains. Without access to classified documents, a whistle-blower’s career, both inside and outside the government, is effectively destroyed. Yet even if a whistle-blower’s actions are vindicated by the OSC or another arbitration body, a federal employer is under no obligation to reinstate a security clearance.

"It's vicarious victimization of the whistle-blower," adds Terance Miethe, author of *Whistleblowing at Work: Tough Choices in Exposing Fraud, Waste and Abuse on the Job*. "They get exonerated and yet nothing happens with security clearance."

"It's a Kafka-esque procedure," adds Doug Hartnett, a staff attorney for the Government Accountability Project. "You're asking the people who took clearance away to give it back to you. There's a visceral reaction to whistle-blowers by these agencies, so they rarely give it back."

According to Kaplan, the legislative solution is simple: Simply give the OSC, or the Merit System Protection Board (the higher body to which OSC rulings can be appealed) the power to rule on security clearances. But, Kaplan says, "there is a lot of political opposition." During the '90s there was an attempt in Congress to close the loophole, but the measure failed after the Department of Justice strenuously objected.

Richard Levernier, a DOE whistle-blower featured in Mark Hertsgaard's *Vanity Fair* article, is himself caught in the judicial Twilight Zone, battling to get back his security clearance. A federal employee for 33 years, Levernier spent the late '90s testing the preparedness of America's nuclear weapons facilities against terrorist attacks. He told the magazine, "Some of the facilities would fail year after year. In more than 50 percent of our tests at the Los Alamos facility, [mock terrorists] got in, captured the plutonium, got out again, and in some cases didn't fire a shot, because we didn't encounter any guards."

Levernier tried in vain to get the DOE to address the problems. When he refused to drop his crusade, his security clearance was revoked over a relatively minor infraction, effectively ending his career. Levernier filed for whistle-blower protection in September 2001, claiming the DOE retaliated against him and gagged his free speech. He took his case to the OSC, which found "a substantial likelihood" that Levernier's charges were accurate. Recently, after the *Vanity Fair* article was published, the DOE agreed and settled with Levernier. The details are confidential, but Hartnett at GAP, who

assisted Levernier, says the whistle-blower is satisfied with the terms.

Still, Levernier remains without his security clearance. "If you lose your security clearance you're screwed," says Brian at the Project on Government Oversight. The law being proposed, known as the Whistleblower Protection Enhancement Act, stipulates that if the OSC finds in favor of a federal whistle-blower who had a security clearance taken away, the employer's agency must publicly explain why it's not reinstating that crucial status.

Looking back on his decision to blow the whistle, Levernier has nothing but regrets: "Given my experience, I would not do it again, even though I truly believe it was the right thing to do. DOE's inappropriate removal of my security clearance has ruined my career and life."

Unfortunately, that's often the norm for the whistle-blower. "It ruins their career, whether they're right or wrong," says Fred Alford, author of *Whistleblowers: Broken Lives and Organizational Power*. "The law and the process take so long, and in the end, cases hinge on issues that have very little to do with the justice of the case, such as how your boss fired you, or who talked to who. It ends up in a strange Twilight Zone. Most whistle-blowers aren't prepared for it — they're not cynics. Cynics don't blow the whistle; idealists do. But you need cynicism to survive it."

What often happens to whistle-blowers as their cases slowly wind their way through arbitration and the courts, is that the original charge of fraud, waste or abuse recedes into the background, and what's left is a mere personnel matter. Because personnel law is weak, the whistle-blower loses. "The original charges become irrelevant," says Donald Soeken, a psychotherapist and a frequent expert witness in whistle-blower cases.

He calls the bureaucratic remedies for whistle-blowers a "cruel hoax." Perhaps the cruelest part is that whistle-blower appeals are heard exclusively by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit. According to critics, this court has eviscerated the original WPA law through judicial activism and has made a mockery out of the appeals process,

ruling against whistle-blowers 83 out of 84 times.

"You can't possibly believe none of those [83] cases had merit," says Soeken. "But they didn't have a chance in hell because the judges won't apply the law fairly. Whistle-blowers spend all this time thinking there's justice down the road, but there is none."

"The law has become useless," says Brian at the Project on Government Oversight. "Nobody can meet the standard [created by the court] for federal employee whistle-blowers — that they have to be the first person to talk about [the fraud], and find out about it not within the function of their job. It's Chinese water torture."

For instance, the court has found the WPA does not protect whistle-blowers who directly confront their supervisor about the supervisor's wrongdoing. Instead, the insiders need to notify more senior officials within the organization in order to qualify for protected status.

Alford recalls one federal whistle-blower he interviewed for his book, "She spent five years and \$50,000 to get two minutes in court and be told she didn't have standing."

Perhaps most upsetting is the new "irrefragable" standard the appeals court has imposed on whistle-blowers. According to the judges, when reviewing any federal whistle-blowing case, the court must begin with the "presumption that public officers perform their duties correctly, fairly, in good faith and in accordance with the law. This presumption stands unless there is 'irrefragable' proof to the contrary."

"Irrefragable" sets an extraordinarily high threshold that means "incontestable, undeniable, incontrovertible." The pending legislation would require a whistle-blower to simply have "reasonable belief" of wrongdoing and be supported by "credible evidence."

The legislation would also break Federal Circuit court's monopoly on federal whistle-blower cases and give plaintiffs the ability to file their appeals in courts throughout the country, based on where they lived. ...

Advocates argue that if the law is not passed soon (realistically, they're hoping for legislative action next year

[in 2004]) whistle-blowers may vanish — and with them, society's best chance of uncovering governmental failures. "Ultimately," says Brian, "no good investigation into government operations can exist without whistle-blowers."

---

## Congress moves to protect federal whistleblowers

Robert Pear

*New York Times*, 3 October 2004

Ashington, Oct. 2 — Over strenuous objections from the Bush administration, Congress is moving to increase protections for federal employees who expose fraud, waste and wrongdoing inside the government.

Lawmakers of both parties say the measures are needed to prevent retaliation against such whistleblowers, who reveal threats to public health, safety and security.

But the administration says the bill unconstitutionally interferes with the president's ability to control and manage the government.

On Wednesday, a House committee approved a whistleblower protection bill. In July, a Senate committee approved a similar measure offering more extensive protections to whistleblowers.

Representative Todd R. Platts, Republican of Pennsylvania, the sponsor of the House bill, said: "We need to protect public servants who expose fraud and intentional misconduct. Court decisions in the last 10 years have eroded whistleblower protections, so that if you're a federal employee, you're often risking your job — and the wrath of your superiors — if you come forward with evidence of wrongdoing."

The Senate bill gained momentum when Senator Susan Collins, Republican of Maine, chairwoman of the Committee on Governmental Affairs, joined Senator Daniel K. Akaka, Democrat of Hawaii, in pushing it.

"The campaign for this legislation went from dormant to active when Senator Collins embraced the bill a few months ago," said Thomas M. Devine, legal director of the Government Accountability Project, a watchdog group that works with

whistleblowers. "That was the turning point."

While the legislation has broad support and a compromise appears to be within reach, it is impossible to know whether the measure will become law. As evidence of a need for legislation, lawmakers cited dozens of cases, including these:

- Federal investigators found that two Border Patrol agents, Mark Hall and Robert Lindemann, were disciplined after they disclosed weaknesses in security along the Canadian border.

- Teresa C. Chambers was dismissed from her job as chief of the United States Park Police after she said the agency did not have enough money or personnel to protect parks and monuments in the Washington area.

- The nation's top Medicare official threatened to fire Richard S. Foster, the chief Medicare actuary, if he provided data to Congress showing the cost of the new Medicare law, which exceeded White House estimates.

Airport baggage screeners say they have been penalized for raising concerns about aviation security. But in August, an independent federal agency, the Merit Systems Protection Board, ruled that they had none of the whistleblower rights available to other federal employees. The government, it said, can "hire, discipline and terminate screeners without regard to any other law."

The United States Office of Special Counsel, which investigates complaints of reprisal before they go to the board, has a large backlog of whistleblower cases, including many pending more than a year.

The terrorist attacks of Sept. 11, 2001, have made the government more secretive, but have also prompted whistleblowers to come forward in greater numbers. "They feel they can no longer stand by knowing that people's lives are at risk," said Danielle Brian, executive director of the Project on Government Oversight, another watchdog group.

Senator Charles E. Grassley, Republican of Iowa, said he knew of several instances in which federal agencies had retaliated against whistleblowers by revoking their security clearances. Because they can no longer do their jobs, Mr. Grassley

said, "the pulling of a security clearance effectively fires employees."

Administration officials gave several reasons for opposing the bills. Peter D. Keisler, an assistant attorney general, said the legislation would encourage frivolous complaints by disgruntled employees, crippling the ability of senior officials to manage the federal work force.

"The bill would convert every federal employee into a potential whistleblower and every minor workplace dispute with a supervisor into a potential whistleblower case," Mr. Keisler said.

Mr. Akaka said the objections came as no surprise. "The Justice Department has an institutional conflict of interest" because it is responsible for defending agencies accused of retaliating against whistleblowers, he said.

Congress has repeatedly tried to protect conscientious civil servants, under laws adopted in 1978, 1989 and 1994. But lawmakers said these efforts had been frustrated by the court that hears appeals from aggrieved federal employees, the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit.

The court often assumes that a federal agency acted properly unless an employee offers "irrefragable proof to the contrary."

The Senate committee cited this as one of many issues on which the court had misinterpreted the law and the intent of Congress. "By definition," it said, "irrefragable means impossible to refute. This imposes an impossible burden on whistleblowers."

By contrast, the House and Senate bills would protect the disclosure of any information that a whistleblower "reasonably believes" to be evidence of government illegality or misconduct.

The legislation would also clarify the right of federal employees, like Mr. Foster, the Medicare actuary, to provide information to Congress, free of threats or reprisals.

[*Editor's note:* Though legislation was approved by US Senate and House committees, it was not put to Congress for a vote. On 18 November 2004, the Government Accountability Project wrote to the leader of the Senate asking that the legislation be presented to Congress.]

### Whistleblowers can win

Peter Bowden

Whistleblower support groups often state that Australian whistleblower protection legislation is inadequate. In many senses, they are right. We have no federal legislation, although there is some very weak protection in the Public Services Act. Generally, Commonwealth public servants are unable to bring in to the open many of the political lies and other abuses in their own ranks without first being willing to sacrifice their own careers.

Also there is effectively no coverage for private sector whistleblowers. There is protection for those who blow the whistle on contraventions of the Corporations Act, and also of the Workplace Relations Act. In addition, the ACCC and ASIC will protect turncoat whistleblowers who give evidence against their former companions in crime. The best known example is the former finance director of HIH, Bill Howard, who will end up putting two of his former accomplices in jail. But using these procedures requires knowledge of the acts and regulations, knowledge that is not normally available to whistleblowers.

The major reason why Whistleblowers Australia argues against the current legislation, however, is that there have been virtually no prosecutions for reprisals against whistleblowers, despite the fact that all states prohibit any victimisation of the whistleblower. In short, the authorities have been unwilling to act.

Prosecutions, however, do not tell the full story. Experience in NSW has shown that the threat of using the NSW Act is a deterrent in itself. As similar legislative acts exist in all states in Australia, it is possible that examples can also be found in other states.

The clauses that are particularly powerful are the no-reprisals and the confidentiality clauses. All states have these clauses. In addition, most states permit injunctions to be taken out against reprisals, as well as the right to institute proceedings for damages if

the whistleblower is harassed in any way.

Three NSW experiences, originating from the Tuesday evening meetings, are illustrative. The first involved a NSW public service staff member, a former whistleblower, who was transferred to 'Siberia' – a work location that was an unattractive backwater. On the justification that his skill was needed there, he had no argument that he was being discriminated against. So he gathered a new group of wrongdoings by his organisation — simple enough in most public service organisations — and wrote to the head of his organisation with the information, outlining his knowledge of the Act, including the fact that he could go public, and reiterated his desire to be transferred back to his original location. He was. He also sought redress of the worst of the wrongdoing.

The second story is that of Professor Bruce Hall and the scientific fraud whistleblowing that resulted in the resignation of the Vice-Chancellor of the University of NSW. Both whistleblowers have kept their jobs, a benefit that can only be put down to the existence of the Act. The issue itself is still very much alive, with Senate speeches on both sides, and the University still taking no action. The whistleblowers, however, did suffer discrimination short of dismissal, and in the opinion of many, should sue. It is an option that is under consideration, but still a big step for the two people involved. Nevertheless, with the support of the Act, that option is a real one.

The third story concerns a security guard who suspected his colleagues of a number of illegal acts — not turning up for work, making job interview questions available, and a possible theft. An initial statement on his part brought frosty denials from his superiors, a broadcasting of the accusations, a consequent threat of being transferred from his current job, and isolation by his fellow workers. His presentation of sufficient evidence to at least raise the possibility that his statements might be true, plus a simple pointing out that the Act's requirement

for confidentiality had likely been breached, together with its implied requirement to investigate, brought a change in attitude. The issues have now been turned over to the organisation's investigation and audit group, the whistleblower has stated his willingness to cooperate, including revealing his sources of information, and his job has been made secure. Early days yet, but it is a win for whistleblowing.

One lesson that comes from these stories is that the acts can be used positively even if they are not actually invoked. A second lesson is that the evidence of acting in the public interest, although not necessarily watertight, still has to be sufficiently strong to convince people that there could be truth behind it. A third and allied lesson out of the Tuesday meetings is that the acts are for protecting people who are working in the public interest. Complaining about a supervisor's wrong or illegal actions, at the same time as complaining about the supervisor's personal behaviour towards the complainant, gives the organisation, and the investigative authorities, an all-too-easy excuse to dismiss the allegations as personal dislike. Unless tangible evidence of wrongdoing can be produced, personal accusations are best dropped. A fourth lesson is the ability to go to the media. Only NSW has this provision, but it is not as useful as one would think. The media would not be interested in most whistleblower stories. The threat is often more effective.

Using the acts in these ways is perhaps a tall order for most whistleblowers. They have to know the acts in sufficient depth to be able to employ them. They also have to have the negotiating skill to use them in meetings with people many times their senior. Most whistleblowers take action on the expectation that the organisation will correct the problem. As we all know it will not. But learning the acts, and how to use them, and giving this advice to potential whistleblowers, is a task that whistleblower support groups could, and should, readily take on.

---

# Draft minutes of WBA's 2004 annual general meeting

---

## WhistleblowersAustralia Inc.

### Annual General Meeting

Melbourne, Victoria  
27 November 2004

1. Meeting chaired by J Lennane, President.  
Minutes taken by C Kardell, National Secretary.

2. **Apologies:** Catherine Crout-Habel, Vince Neary, Ted Regan, Jeannie Berger, Feliks Perera, Derek Maitland and Greg Locke.

3. **Attendance:** [omitted]

4. **Previous minutes:** J Lennane referred to the previous minutes published in the January 2004 edition of *The Whistle*, having noted C Kardell's apology for not being able to provide a copy. She asked if anyone present could move that the previous minutes as published, be accepted as a true and accurate record.

Proposed: Matilda Bawden. Seconded: Lori O'Keeffe.

Business arising: nil.

### 5. Election of office bearers

J Lennane, nominee for the position of National President, stood down for Brian Martin to proceed as returning officer.

Position of National President. Jean Lennane, being the only nominee, was elected unopposed. Cynthia Kardell led the meeting in thanking her for her continuing goodwill, and leadership.

Jean acted as returning officer for the rest of the election process.

The following nominees to the Executive were elected unopposed:

Vice President: Peter Bennett

Junior Vice President: Kim Sawyer.

Treasurer: Feliks Perera.

Secretary: Cynthia Kardell

National Director: Greg McMahon.

Jean Lennane congratulated the incoming office bearers on behalf of the meeting and thanked them for their continuing good work and support of Whistleblowers.

National Ordinary Committee Members (6).

The following six nominees were elected unopposed: Matilda Bawden (SA), Catherine Crout-Habel (SA), Geoff Turner (NSW), Information Technology, Peter Bowden (NSW), Education Officer, Stan van de Wiel (Vic) and Brian Martin (NSW), International Director.

C Kardell moved a motion to co-opt Derek Maitland, who had been nominated for the national committee, as a casual member, to act as Media Liaison Officer. Seconded by G McMahon. Carried.

Jean Lennane reminded the meeting that J Pezy, as SA branch president, was automatically part of the National Committee. Jean congratulated the incoming members and urged them and their colleagues to be actively involved at a national level.

### 6. Position of Public Officer

Jean Lennane advised the meeting that Vince Neary was willing to continue in the position of Public Officer if required. Agreed: Vince's offer to be accepted with our thanks.

Business arising: Jean Lennane advised that Vince Neary had forwarded an authority to pay the annual lodgement fee to the Department of Fair Trading, pursuant to legislative requirements, and requested that two financial members be authorised by the meeting to sign the application form on its behalf.

Brian Martin moved the motion: John Pezy seconded it. Carried: Jean Lennane and Cynthia Kardell authorised so to do.

7. **Treasurer's Report:** J Lennane tabled a financial statement for the 12

month period ending 30 June 2004, provided by F Perera. Briefly, details are as follows:

\$5,187.66: income, (subscriptions, donations, book account and bank balance)

\$2,302.71: expenses (*Whistle* production, insurance, networking expenses, refunds to branches & AGM costs ,etc.)

\$2,884.95: excess of income over expenditure,

\$4,871.51: accumulated fund balance b/f,

\$2,884.95: add income over expenditure,

\$7,756.46: balance at bank, 30 June 2004.

Jean Lennane called for the report to be accepted as a true and accurate statement of accounts. Proposed: Peter Bennett. Seconded: Peter Bowden. Carried.

Business arising:

B Martin, editor of *The Whistle*, explained how it was produced and published. He asked the members to continue to provide articles and other material. He thanked Feliks Perera for the efficient manner in which he processed the accounts.

C Kardell advised that membership was down on last year's figures, and that members were generally tardy with their annual renewal of subscription. She urged members to recruit new members, by trading their help and assistance for others, for membership.

8. **Other business.** There being no formal agenda items, the meeting was opened for state reports and general discussion.

(i) ACT: Peter Bennett reported that they had about five people actively involved in ACT, and was optimistic that once they had a meeting venue and a little more cohesion they might be able to form a branch. They are involved in about four cases, including his own which is progressing nicely.

(ii) Queensland: Greg McMahon reported that he had been able to obtain the Executive's support to nominate the case of Queensland police whistleblower Col Dillon as a case of national significance, like that of Jim Leggate, who has moved to Tasmania and Kevin Lindeberg, who looks like getting up an inquiry into the Goss government.

Col Dillon is credited with having been the catalyst for the Fitzgerald Inquiry in Queensland. Greg reported that Col Dillon had been ostracised, and eventually left without a desk or office, by those who claimed to be part of the reformed Queensland police.

Whistleblowers Action Group (WAG) continues to make annual awards. The 2004 award went to NSW radio presenter Alan Jones, who spoke out about the conviction of Pauline Hanson. He was presented with a certificate and cup.

WAG was unsuccessful in its bid to retain charitable status: the Australian Taxation Office decided WAG did not provide 'direct immediate relief' to whistleblowers.

(iii) SA: John Pezy reported that the SA branch has been busy at a local level: it continues to offer support and assistance by telephone, email and in person. He reported on two long running cases, that of Angela Morgan and Shelley Pezy, which continue to provide a catalyst for their attempts to reform the judicial system.

(iv) Victoria: Mervyn Vogt reported that he did not believe Nathan Moore, RAAF whistleblower, would be alive, but for his efforts. Nathan had blown the whistle on drug trading and use in the services. He had been vindicated, but had been beaten up, hospitalised and will have poor help and be disabled for the rest of his life. He has been invalidated out of the service.

Telstra continues to resist reform: Mervyn was unsuccessful in his last attempt to be appointed to the Board. Christina Schwerin had got SBS coverage for Stan van de Wiel's story. The aged care sector was developing into the next big story, as elderly people were being pushed out of their homes, and their assets wrongly appropriated.

(v) NSW: Cynthia Kardell reported that NSW continued to provide telephone, email and direct support, by its Tuesday night meetings. We had two formal press releases at Parliament House, with the assistance of Greens MP Lee Rhiannon, one calling for a judicial inquiry into the University of NSW and the other calling for a national strategy for the investigation of 'convenient' police or whistleblower deaths.

We contributed to the review of the ICAC Act and continue to attend the meetings of the Internal Witness Advisory Council, which oversees whistleblower protection and whistleblowing in the NSW Police.

(vi) International Liaison: Brian Martin reported that international dialogue continues to be brisk. Australia is one of only two national whistleblower organisations in the world made up primarily of whistleblowers. The other is Freedom to Care, in the UK. The US has the Government Accountability Project, but that is run by lawyers. Recently he had contact from the Florida Whistleblowers, a new body, which hopes to have an organisation like ours.

(vii) Communications: Geoff Turner reported that whistleblowers.org.au receives quite a few emails. His load has been recently reduced by the addition of Peter Bennett's name as a contact. The website is fairly basic, but is about to undergo an upgrade by Geoff, Cynthia and Peter, which will not deviate from the original decision to keep it simple, accessible and able to be used by the vision impaired.

(viii) Education: Peter Bowden reported that Cynthia and Peter did a session on whistleblowing at the University of Technology Sydney. Peter has given two courses to Chinese students, through the University of Sydney, and he has obtained a grant of \$10,000 to assess whistleblowing legislation across the nation. The results of the research are being put up on the university website, on a page developed by Peter for the purpose, which he hopes will become a useful resource for whistleblowers and others.

(ix) President's Report: Jean Lennane said that the last several years have seen a steady increase in the calibre and capacity of long term, committed members: we have come a long way since the organisation was founded in 1991. For example, Brian's and Geoff's work is enabling the organisation to reach out to whistleblowers in ways we have not had before.

The recent FBI sting on pornography has pushed our police services to respond in a hitherto unimagined way and many arrests were made. This is progress.

Griffith University has received a very large grant to study whistleblowing, and the research team says it will welcome input from WBA. This is progress.

We will do more media releases. The second one, about Gary Lee Rogers, led to WBA being formally joined as a party to the inquest into his death. The Coroner has foreshadowed that she will deal with the mental health area and the police investigation in her report. A couple of wins there: one was that the press has finally got on top of the fact that mentally ill people are starving and often being killed. Gary's case is typical. He was sick, depressed, convalescent and needed daily contact and care. The mental health representative, expected to visit every day, came only once, over a week down the track, couldn't raise Gary, left a card and went away. Gary might still be alive but for that.

So, good and bad: but rather worryingly, we do seem to have slipped into George Orwell's *1984*. But press on!

### Other General Business

1. SA agreed to put on the 2005 AGM on the weekend 9-11 September 2005.
2. Motion moved by P Bennett, by proxy for C Schwerin, and seconded by C Kardell. Agreed: that WBA authorise the 2004 AGM committee to arrange for WBA to thank the founding members of WBA.

Meeting Closed.

---

## Whistleblowers Australia contacts

---

**ACT contact:** Peter Bennett, phone 02 6254 1850, fax 02 6254 3755, [whistleblowers@iprimus.com.au](mailto:whistleblowers@iprimus.com.au); Mary Lander, phone 0419 658 308; [mary.wba@ozemail.com.au](mailto:mary.wba@ozemail.com.au)

### New South Wales

**“Caring & Sharing” meetings** We listen to your story, provide feedback and possibly guidance for your next few steps. Held every Tuesday night 7:30 p.m., Presbyterian Church Hall, 7-A Campbell St., Balmain 2041.

**General meetings** are held in the Church Hall on the first Sunday in the month commencing at 1:30 pm. (Please confirm before attending.) The July general meeting is the AGM.

**Contact:** Cynthia Kardell, phone/fax 02 9484 6895; messages phone 02 9810 9468; [ckardell@iprimus.com.au](mailto:ckardell@iprimus.com.au)  
*Website:* <http://www.whistleblowers.org.au/>

**Goulburn region:** Rob Cumming, 0428 483 155.

**Wollongong:** Brian Martin, 02 4221 3763.  
*Website:* <http://www.uow.edu.au/arts/sts/bmartin/dissent/>

**Queensland contacts:** Feliks Perera, phone/fax 07 5448 8218; Greg McMahon, 07 3378 7232 (a/h) [also Whistleblowers Action Group contact]

**South Australian contacts:** Matilda Bawden, 08 8258 8744 (a/h); John Pezy, 08 8337 8912

### Whistle

Editor: Brian Martin, [bmartin@uow.edu.au](mailto:bmartin@uow.edu.au), 02 4221 3763, 02 4228 7860

Associate editors: Don Eldridge, Isla MacGregor, Kim Sawyer.

Thanks to Cynthia Kardell and Patricia Young for proofreading.

---

## WBA AGM and conference

---

On the weekend of 27-28 November, WBA's annual general meeting and conference were held in Melbourne. The event was highly successful, for which special thanks go to the main organisers, Lori O'Keeffe, Kim Sawyer and Stan van de Wiel.

The draft minutes of the AGM are found in this issue, on pages 10-11, including information on the election of members of the national committee.

At the dinner on Saturday evening, founding members of WBA were honoured. Three of the original group of founding members, of what was then called Whistleblowers Anonymous, were able to attend:

- Bill Toomer — see photo on page 1 — who suffered reprisals after he ordered fumigation of a ship in the early 1970s; his case has led to numerous inquiries in the decades since;

- Keith Potter, a Victorian member and indefatigable advocate for whistleblowers, including immense efforts on behalf of Bill Toomer;

- Jean Lennane, national president of WBA, whose wisdom and calm good sense have been crucial in keeping the organisation on a sound footing.

Bill, Keith and Jean received framed certificates of life membership in WBA plus signed copies of Debbie Locke's book *Watching the Detectives* and Jack Ellis's book *Murder of an Airline*. In thanks for her contributions, Jean also received a silver whistle on a chain.

At the conference on Sunday, Stephen Bolsin and Kim Sawyer gave talks and many others contributed to panel discussions. Photos from the conference will be featured in future issues of *The Whistle*.

The 2005 AGM and conference will be held in Adelaide on 9-11 September. Stay tuned for details.

## Whistleblowers Australia membership

Membership of WBA involves an annual fee of \$25, payable to Whistleblowers Australia, renewable each June. Membership includes an annual subscription to *The Whistle*, and members receive discounts to seminars, invitations to briefings/discussion groups, plus input into policy and submissions.

If you want to subscribe to *The Whistle* but not join WBA, then the annual subscription fee is \$25.

The activities of Whistleblowers Australia depend entirely on voluntary work by members and supporters. We value your ideas, time, expertise and involvement. Whistleblowers Australia is funded almost entirely from membership fees, donations and bequests.

**Send memberships and subscriptions to Feliks Perera, National Treasurer, 1/5 Wayne Ave, Marcoola Qld 4564. Phone/Fax 07 5448 8218.**