



## Contents

- DIRECTOR'S REVIEW 1
- AUSTRALIA'S NEW PEACE AND SECURITY AGENDA 3
- OUTSIDE THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENCE 5
- BOOK REVIEW: THE MEDIA AND THE RWANDA GENOCIDE 6
- BOOK REVIEW: A LIFE ENHANCING WAY OF THINKING 7
- HANS BLIX IN SYDNEY 8
- HOPE RING OUT IN VOICES OF PROTEST 9
- PATHS TO JUSTICE AND PROSPERITY: WEST PAPUA 2007 10
- TAMING WAR – WHY I WROTE IT 11
- GLEBE BOOK LAUNCH 12
- A UNITED NATIONS EMERGENCY PEACE SERVICE 12
- FROM MARRICKVILLE TO BETHLEHEM 12

**Editor** - Coral Hauenstein  
P 02 9351 7686 - F 02 9660 0862  
E coral.hauenstein@arts.usyd.edu.au  
Mackie Building K01  
The University of Sydney  
Sydney NSW 2006

**Layout/Graphic Design** -  
Ximena Tapia - P 02 9648 6046  
E ximenatapia@yahoo.com

**Photo credits** - Jaime Koh, Mike Otterman, Alex Bainbridge

Comments and contributions welcome.  
coral.hauenstein@arts.usyd.edu.au

### DISCLAIMER

The views in this publication are solely those of the contributors.

## Director's Review

By Jake Lynch

**SO, THE HOWARD GOVERNMENT GOT WHAT IT WANTED – DAVID HICKS IS NOW SAFELY OUT OF THE HEADLINES, WITH THE FEDERAL ELECTION PERHAPS ANOTHER TWO MONTHS AWAY, LONG ENOUGH FOR MEMORIES TO HAVE FADED.**

The outcome was messy, and constructed so as to save face all round - a "charade", the Law Council said, "that only served to corrode the rule of law". But those of us who raised our voices in protest can take some quiet satisfaction at the outcome of the campaign to get Hicks out of the gulag at Guantanamo Bay.

It's important to consider how the outcome was brought about. I can imagine being a media adviser to the Prime Minister, witnessing the Canberra Convergence, featured in the last edition of Peacewrites back in March, and concluding that it was time to close the issue down.

This was on the day Parliament reassembled for the first time after the long Summer recess, and all that evening's television news bulletins featured pictures of the demonstration, and speakers condemning ministers for allowing their obeisance to US military diktat to trump their duty to an Australian citizen.

In political terms, the cost of letting the story continue had been raised to an unacceptable level – a deal had to be done, and duly was. The pressure was built up by a classic campaign of social activism. It had a simple demand, behind which many shades of opinion could unite – Bring Hicks Home. It was well resourced, with the Get Up group, in particular, performing a sterling service – not forgetting the Anti War Action Group of students here at Sydney University.

And it kept on growing, broader and deeper, till it became unignorable.

There are even promising signs that the lessons have sunk in, and the pendulum is swinging away from the purveyors of what Get Up calls 'emotional terrorism'. There was a time, not so long back, when ministers and officials could have expected a ready media reception for bellicose statements, and leaks of pejorative 'information', in a case such as that of Mohammed Haneef, the Gold Coast doctor absolved of terror charges over the failed UK bomb attacks in July but – by then – already deprived of his resident's visa.

In the event, the case against him rapidly unravelled in public, with Murdoch's *Sunday Telegraph* left looking particularly silly after it used pictures of the doc posing in front of the tower blocks of Surfers Paradise to illustrate a story suggesting that he was plotting to fly a plane into one of them.

In the US, meanwhile, the Supreme Court reversed an earlier decision and opened the way for all the detainees at Guantanamo to challenge the legality of their detention. It's against that backdrop that election debates over 'security' will be waged – you can make a modest contribution to the tone and content of those debates by signing Get Up's online petition, if you haven't already:

"We expect you to protect us from terrorism, but demand you do so in a way that maintains the integrity of our legal system, due process, and our valued rights and freedoms. We demand a trusted counter-terrorism system that responds to legitimate threats, not imagined or political ones".

(at [www.getup.org.au](http://www.getup.org.au))

## Operation Talisman Sabre

June saw the biggest-ever military exercise on Australian soil, Operation Talisman Sabre, with 7,500 home troops joined by no fewer than 20,000 Americans. CPACS research estimated the cost at \$130 million, including the purchase of new equipment. Some of the latter was to fit out a new training installation, a mock town, designed for simulating urban warfare. So who was the putative enemy in this exercise? A question Defence was keen to play down, dubbing it a “culturally non-specific” collection of buildings.

In a news release, put out through the Sydney University press office, I said: “Defence should come clean... there is no country on earth where Australian interests are better served by invading alongside the United States than by playing to our traditional strengths of UN peacekeeping and diplomacy”.

It’s a statement that would almost certainly enjoy widespread acceptance by Australians today. And, the news release went on, the annual cost of Australia’s existing commitments, to various peacekeeping missions around our region and the world, is also about \$130 million. In other words, we could redouble our contribution, if only we were not wasting taxpayers’ money on practising whatever invasion the Pentagon or the White House next dreams up.

On this occasion, the media response was, by comparison, puny. Most Australians would only have heard about the exercise when it was already over, mentioned in passing in reports of the USS Kitty Hawk aircraft carrier docking in Sydney harbour; reports which, by and large, represented the vessel as a tourist attraction.

It’s a sign, then, that anti-war campaigning has not yet attained the critical mass of the campaign to Bring Hicks Home. If we try to think of a slogan with equal potential for traction across a broad cross-section of public and political opinion, what would it be? Choose Peace?

## Global Peace Index

If so, then we have to continue to rehabilitate ‘peace’ as a word acceptable in polite conversation. One notable contribution to that very task is the Global Peace Index, launched in May and the creation of Sydney business leader and philanthropist, Steve Killelea, with support from CPACS. Steve has a real flair – and seemingly limitless energy – for reaching out to movers and shakers around the world, from Bob Geldof to the Dalai Lama.

The Index is a league table of 121 countries around the world, ranked according to several dozen criteria for their internal and external peacefulness. Indicators range from the level of trust between citizens to the sophistication of a country’s military. Australia comes in at number 25, which sounds OK till you consider that New Zealand, for instance, is number two – and there are plenty of liberal democracies with small-to-medium populations with a higher ranking than us.

The Index is intended to enter into calculations – in politics, business and every other field – about conflict and the responses we make to it. After its launch, it rapidly became a global media phenomenon, with estimates that as many as a billion people may have heard or read about it. It will reach still more with the release of a documentary to go with it, hopefully at a cinema screen near you by the end of this year.

## UBUNTU CPACS theatre group

A group that incorporates theatre and poetry to promote social justice. Meeting Monday nights at 6pm at CPACS.

For further information contact Jennifer Cutler 0408 706 961 or email [jensand@hotmail.com](mailto:jensand@hotmail.com).

## New UN initiatives

If the GPI brings a little bit more pressure to look for effective non-violent responses to conflict, then it will have done us all a service. Back in the 1990s, there was a debate in the UK (languishing at number 47) and other countries, over what to do about former Yugoslavia, divided between exponents of two views – ‘something must be done’ and ‘nothing can be done’.

The former won out, eventually, in both Bosnia and Kosovo. Trouble is, the ‘something’ turned out to be more violence, making the underlying issues still more difficult to resolve. Bosnia today appears frozen in time, while Kosovo was, at the time of writing, still defying the attempts of UN negotiators to broker a settlement acceptable to all sides.

Now, two UN initiatives are – in their different ways – helping to bridge the divide, and putting more non-violent tools in the hands of policy-makers. One already exists – the Peacebuilding Commission, brainchild of Secretary General Kofi Annan, which has brought co-ordination and common sense to international efforts to help Burundi and Sierra Leone to step away from violent conflict, and is destined now for East Timor. It’s featured in the article in this edition of *PeaceWrites* (p.3), by Dr Wendy Lambourne, about the challenges and opportunities Australia faces in its interventions in conflict in the Asia-Pacific region.

The other is at the stage of a proposal, being discussed both at UN HQ in New York and here at CPACS. Annie Herro has joined our team to carry out research on plans for a UN Emergency Peace Service, precisely to allow ‘something to be done’ without that providing an excuse for self-interested and counter-productive military intervention. She explains more in her article on page 12.

## The media

So, we can imagine a demand for an anti-war movement, and we at CPACS are doing our bit to fill in gaps in understanding about what it might mean in practice, in different places and circumstances. We're also working more closely now with the Anti-war Action Group, helping to provide what resources we can, where appropriate, for their own energetic and imaginative campaigning. The visit of Matt Howard, in August, from Iraq Veterans Against War, was one of our co-productions. He spoke in memorable terms, about what war is really like, to a packed house at the Footbridge Theatre.

The remaining pre-requisite for a successful campaign is an effective media strategy, and here, CPACS is working at the leading edge of global research. The concept of Peace Journalism is rapidly attaining greater traction, both among journalists and in the international scholarly community.

One of its leading experts, Professor Robert A Hackett, of Simon Fraser University in Vancouver, visited us in April to present findings from NewsWatch Canada on coverage of the wars in Afghanistan and Lebanon; he also launched his latest book, *Remaking Media – the struggle to democratise public communication*, at Gleebooks.

Our August seminar, with Campus Conversations, about the representation of Muslims and Islam in Sydney media, saw the formation of a working group to monitor the output of newspapers, television and radio, and raise the pressure for better performance. And our September event, *Becoming Media-Savvy*, offers specialist training to peace groups and those working for social justice, to tailor and present their message in such a way as to maximise coverage for their concerns and perspectives. Slowly but surely, the dots are being joined.

## Australia's New Peace and Security Agenda by Wendy Lambourne

**AUSTRALIA HAS TRADITIONALLY BEEN A STRONG SUPPORTER OF MULTILATERALISM AND UNITED NATIONS PEACEKEEPING MISSIONS. HOWEVER, FOLLOWING THE ATTACKS ON THE WORLD TRADE CENTER AND PENTAGON IN THE US IN SEPTEMBER 2001, AUSTRALIA'S REGIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL SECURITY PRIORITIES HAVE BEEN DRIVEN BY ITS SUPPORT FOR THE 'WAR ON TERROR'. THE PERCEPTION THAT TERRORISM IS THE MOST SERIOUS THREAT TO AUSTRALIA'S SECURITY HAS MEANT THAT FOREIGN POLICY AND MILITARY OBJECTIVES HAVE FOLLOWED THE US 'WAR ON TERROR' AGENDA, WITH LESS EMPHASIS ON SUPPORT FOR MULTILATERAL PEACEKEEPING AND PEACEBUILDING THROUGH THE UN.**

The Australian government has sent troops to fight in both Afghanistan and Iraq – including the use of armed force outside the mandate of the UN – and has maintained large contingents of military and other personnel in both countries. At the same time, Australia has focused on unilateral and non-UN multilateral regional missions in so-called fragile states in the Asia/Pacific region in order to build functioning and effective state systems that will increase regional stability and avoid the potential for terrorists to use these countries as bases for their operations.

Australia led an international coalition to provide the military component of UNMIT, the UN Integrated Mission in Timor-Leste that was established by UNSC Resolution 1704 in August 2006. Australia welcomed the resolution which provided a more substantial mandate for UN peacekeepers to restore peace and security in East Timor. In response to a request from the Timorese government for assistance in

restoring peace and stability following the political violence in May 2006, Australia deployed about 800 ADF personnel as part of Operation Astute as well as contributing police to the UN Police Force providing security in Dili.

The task soon expanded beyond disarmament to one of supporting political reform, and Australia has found itself enmeshed and compromised in its intervention strategy by the use of force against the rebel soldier, Major Alfredo Reinado, in March 2007. The assault on Reinado and killing of several East Timorese in Same has been perceived as a loss of Australian neutrality. Local residents told reporters that the way the Australian troops had handled and arrested the people was "worse than Indonesia". The operation was defended by the Australian commander as being conducted with "understanding of the need for sensitivity and respect for civilians", but observers fear that it has contributed to a loss of hearts and minds in the peacebuilding enterprise.

In Afghanistan, Australia has made a significant contribution to the non-UN International Security Assistance Force (ISAF). Approximately 20 liaison officers are serving in ISAF headquarters and about 30 command, security and support personnel are located in Kabul with the ADF National Command Element. Approximately 370 personnel are serving in the Reconstruction Task Force (RTF) which is Australia's contribution to the Netherlands-led Provincial Reconstruction Team in Afghanistan's Oruzgan Province. The RTF's work includes reconstruction and improvement of provincial infrastructure such as schools, hospitals and bridges, as well as community-based projects such as trade training courses designed to build indigenous capacity.

Defence Minister Robert Hill announced that in March 2006 a detachment of two Chinook helicopters

and 110 personnel would be based at Kandahar air field to provide aero-medical evacuation as well as air mobility and logistic support to coalition partners based in Afghanistan. By contrast, the ADF provides one officer to the UN Assistance Mission in Afghanistan (UNAMA).

After supporting the US-led invasion of Iraq in 2003, a multinational use of force not sanctioned by the UN Security Council, Australia has made a major commitment of military personnel to the coalition force rebuilding Iraq. Operation Catalyst, which commenced in July 2003, currently comprises 1450 ADF personnel, almost twice that deployed in East Timor. These personnel include army trainers, a security detachment, airlift sustainment and support, maritime patrol, logistics and communications, and HMAS Toowoomba which is protecting Iraq's offshore assets such as oil platforms. About 90 personnel are serving in the multinational force headquarters and units. Several Australians hold key posts, including Colonel Peter Jeffrey who is the Military Adviser to the UN Special Representative of the Secretary-General in Iraq.

One of Australia's most significant regional contributions to peace and security is its continuing deployment of ADF troops and AFP in Solomon Islands. The ADF contingent of approximately 140 personnel works alongside personnel from New Zealand, Tonga, Fiji and Papua New Guinea. The Regional Assistance Mission in Solomon Islands (RAMSI), also known as 'Operation Helpem Friend', was established in July 2003 at the invitation of the Solomon Islands' government. Its mandate includes restoration of law and order as well as state-building tasks including assistance with the effective functioning of government and economic recovery. Questions have been raised about the level of interference in domestic affairs, with the appointment of Australians to positions within the Ministry of

Finance, pressure on the SI government to institute certain fiscal management policies, and the granting of identical powers to AFP as to local police. At the same time the mission can be seen as an inadequate attempt at nation-building because of its focus on the functioning of government without tackling the need for a more accountable system of government that addresses the needs and concerns of citizens.

Australia's intervention in the Solomon Islands is part of its strategy to support 'fragile states' which are seen as threats to security in the region. Australian activities in so-called 'fragile states' include support for development and good governance through AUSAID programs in Papua New Guinea, Vanuatu, Nauru and Kiribati. Australia has also been involved in supporting law and order in Fiji and in November 2006 Australia sent about 50 ADF personnel to support the New Zealand-led combined military force that is working with the Tongan Security Forces to return stability to that country.

Diplomatic tensions and allegations of interference in domestic affairs have been associated with RAMSI as well as the 'enhanced cooperation package' in PNG. For example, in August 2003 the PNG Prime Minister reacted angrily to reports describing the PNG government as corrupt and Australian government calls for a review of bilateral aid. In January 2004 Australian government representatives were seen to be influencing the outcome of Solomon Island government negotiations to avoid a strike. In September 2006 the Australian High Commissioner was expelled from the Solomon Islands, and then the Australian government tried to prevent an Australian citizen from being appointed as Attorney-General in the Solomons. A recent editorial in *The Canberra Times* (13 February 2007) described Australian government actions as being seen by Solomon Islanders as 'high-handed and condescending'. In a letter to the editor

of the *Australian Financial Review* (13 February 2007), four prominent Australian former diplomats criticised RAMSI for having 'overlooked and overridden social and cultural norms and sensitivities'.

Australia is arguably tainted by its relationship with the US-led intervention in Iraq which is regarded by many as illegitimate and as creating local resentment and greater instability in the region. Mirroring the experience of the US in the Middle East, Australia is being seen by some in the Pacific as a neo-imperialist nation trying to impose Western values and systems of governance. The Australian policy emphasis on state-building can be criticised for not paying sufficient attention to alternative existing models of community organisation and means of ensuring law and order. Australia's increasing influence and incidents such as Foreign Minister Downer's criticism of the Prime Minister of the Solomon Islands, and the killing of East Timorese during an attempt to capture rebel leader Reinado, illustrate the fine line between being seen as the caring big brother and the neighbourhood bully.

The question can be asked whether Australia's involvement in these unilateral and non-UN multilateral interventions is undermining the legitimacy and reputation of the UN's role in maintaining international peace and security. The issue is not so much about 'who' is doing the intervening, but 'how' the missions are conceived and received. After all, regional interventions are sanctioned under Chapter VIII of the UN Charter, and the 2005 World Summit advocated strengthening of regional organisations and their ability to intervene in response to threats to international peace and security. However, in the absence of a permanent regional peace and security organisation capable of intervening in the Asia/Pacific, and the unwillingness or inability of the UN to intervene (as in the Solomons, for example), such ad

hoc regional interventions could be seen as legitimate if they are multilateral and operate according to the principles set out in the UN Charter.

The challenge is to ensure that Australian-led interventions are seen as legitimate not only by the governments concerned but also by the people in each country. To date, experiences with its interventions in the Pacific suggest that the absence of international legitimacy and perceived neutrality provided by a UN mandate have created diplomatic tensions that threaten to undermine the success of these missions in achieving their objectives.

A greater emphasis on local empowerment and capacity-building could provide an antidote to this perception of neocolonial interventionism. This approach has been used successfully to negotiate a peace settlement in Mindanao in the Philippines and also in Bougainville where Australia played a significant role. According to ANU's Tony Regan, Australia failed to learn these lessons in relation to its intervention in Solomon Islands:

"I think that Australia in some ways learnt the wrong lessons from Bougainville. Australia had learnt that it could play a constructive role in the region, and by operating with a regional mission it got more legitimacy, it wasn't seen as neo-colonial. And I think if Australia had taken away one lesson from the Bougainville peace process, it should have been about the nature of the intervention, the nature of the way you run an intervention in support of peace processes and conflict resolution in Melanesia, that you need to do it very gently, you need to build good relationships, you need to really understand the local context, and as far as possible, you need to encourage local actors to sort out things themselves, rather than try and impose what you think might be the best solution." (ABC Radio National, Background Briefing, 8 April 2007)

The Peacebuilding Commission set up by the UN in 2006 provides an opportunity to develop principles of best practice in peacebuilding interventions which Australia could use to build on its experience in Bougainville. These principles include the importance of involving civil society and promoting local capacity-building, as well as integration and coordination across sectors. Achieving a perception of neutrality is difficult, even for the UN, when working with a government that inevitably represents only one side of politics, but the legitimacy of a UN-sanctioned multilateral intervention helps to counter this risk. Furthermore, it would help to reduce the complications in diplomatic relations that we have seen emerging in Australia's relations with its Pacific neighbours as a result of its peace and security interventions. And, most significantly, it could provide a more comprehensive approach that is more successful in promoting sustainable peace for the people as well as states in the region.

.....

**THIS IS AN ABRIDGED AND UPDATED VERSION OF AN ARTICLE WRITTEN BY WENDY LAMBOURNE AND JOSEPH TOMAN ORIGINALLY PUBLISHED BY THE UNITED NATIONS ASSOCIATION OF AUSTRALIA IN AUSTRALIA AND THE UNITED NATIONS: A REPORT CARD (CAMBERRA: UNAA, 2007).**

**OTHER CHAPTERS IN THE REPORT CARD COVER AN ASSESSMENT OF AUSTRALIA'S PERFORMANCE IN RELATION TO THE UN AND HUMAN RIGHTS, MILLENNIUM DEVELOPMENT GOALS, CLIMATE CHANGE, DISARMAMENT, GLOBAL MOVEMENT OF PEOPLE, STATUS OF WOMEN, SEXUAL AND REPRODUCTIVE HEALTH IN THE AID PROGRAM, AND YOUTH.**

**COPIES OF THE UNAA REPORT CARD MAY BE OBTAINED FROM UNAAACT@CYBERONE.COM.AU.**

## Outside the Department of Defence \*

On an early morning cold  
behind the broad glass doors,  
his tripod steady as a gun turret,  
a well dressed operative fingers  
his Defence Department camera,  
peers into the viewfinder and aims

at the pavement's banner holders  
protesting more rehearsals for war.  
He films sixty protesters  
against sixty thousand soldiers  
about to bomb mock villages and  
villagers,  
this latest military madness  
to be camouflaged as defence

but blue serge security legions,  
the robots of risk reduction,  
are guarding the man with the camera,  
their arms folded, legs apart,  
boots anchored, faces lost to happiness,  
their bodies dressed  
by a rationality connected  
to the goosesteps of another age.

They have been ordered to watch  
these protesters striving  
to touch the wellsprings of their  
passions  
for the record,  
before this camera,  
on a sidewalk  
before commuters  
on a cold morning  
outside the Department of Defence.

*Stuart Rees June 17th 2007*

\* Commemorating the June 15th peace protest against the Talisman Sabre defence exercises in North Queensland

## The Media and the Rwanda Genocide

*Edited by Allan Thompson (Pluto Press, London, 463 pp – now in CPACS Resource Centre)*

### REVIEWED BY JAKE LYNCH FOR PEACEWRITES

One of the contributors to this important book, a French journalist, refers to Rwanda as “a genocide without images”. Many others testify to the failure of television and newspapers alike to convey with sufficient urgency to the outside world the horrific events unfolding inside the country in a few short months of 1994, in which over 800,000 people were killed.

How come? There are the US correspondents - sent in, then, just as quickly, pulled out by their newsdesks, overheard muttering in their hotel bar about a story that was “too dangerous... not enough interest... in the middle of nowhere”. There is the BBC producer who saw one TV report, containing pictures gathered “at great personal risk”, consigned to the cutting-room floor because bosses back in London considered it too graphic for a teatime audience.

The book opens with a statement by Kofi Annan, then head of the UN Peacekeeping Department, which turned down a request by its chief of mission in Rwanda, the Canadian general, Romeo Dallaire, for more troops; troops which, Dallaire believes, could have forestalled the slaughter.

The British journalist, Linda Melvern, obtained secret notes of discussions in closed session at the Security Council, revealing how the US and its ever-faithful ally, the UK, led efforts to prevent the very word, ‘genocide’ from appearing in official communiqués; her chapter is one of the most riveting in the book. To declare a genocide would have been to ratchet up the pressure on member states to intervene, and America, after the infamous pictures of its soldiers being dragged around the

streets of Mogadishu barely eighteen months earlier, was in no mood to go back in to an African war.

Instead of the reinforcements he called for, Dallaire received orders to pull out, a decision greeted with little remark, indeed, outside of specialist circles – events in Rwanda, when they were reported at all, were still confined to the inside pages. Ultimately, the world did wake up, when colossal refugee camps formed in neighbouring countries and a humanitarian emergency saw an international relief operation swing into action.

Bitterest of ironies – many of those now in receipt of food and shelter were responsible for the genocide – Hutus forced to flee as the invading Tutsi army, the Rwandan Patriotic Front, gained the upper hand in a renewed civil war. But hunger, in Africa, was a familiar story, one the media could understand, and journalists - many of whom had just finished covering the unfolding news elsewhere, of South Africa’s first free election - pitched in.

### Rwandan media

Rwanda’s own media played a sinister role in the genocide. Kangura, a newspaper in the capital, Kigali, reproduced slurs and played on fears about marauding Tutsis grabbing Hutu women and subjugating the majority population. Radio Rwanda dutifully reported the ‘invasion’ of Kigali, supposedly by the RPF but actually consisting of a few dozen government troops firing their guns along empty streets in a pre-dawn curfew. It was used to justify a security ‘crackdown’, in which hundreds were arbitrarily arrested and detained.

Later, Radio Milles Collines (RTLM) broadcast hate speech, and even direct instructions to kill, to the Interahamwe militias carrying out the genocide. For that, some of their broadcasters were brought before the international war crimes tribunal at Arusha, which found

the deaths of certain individuals were “causally linked” to their having been mentioned on air. A transcript of the summary judgement against the editor of Kangura, and two of the prime movers behind RTLM, is included in the book.

There’s also a very readable account of the political background to the genocide, the events that triggered it, the shortcomings of the response from the international community and the events since, including Rwanda’s shameful role in plundering mineral wealth in the Democratic Republic of Congo, worsening a war whose appalling human cost overshadows even that of the genocide itself.

The writer is Gerald Caplan, who deserves a special mention as he worked tirelessly, through the late 1990s and beyond, to ensure that Rwanda was not forgotten and that the international community did indeed take seriously, at long last, the duty to “liberate mankind from such an odious scourge”, enshrined in the Genocide Convention of 1948.

Gerry is introduced in the notes on authors as having written a training course on the Rwandan Genocide and the Media, which indeed he did, for IMPS, the Institute for Media, Peace and Security, an initiative of the UN Peace University. I know that because I worked on it with him, together with Annabel McGoldrick, who many will know as a part-time lecturer here at CPACS and a reporter with SBS World News Australia.

Annabel and I used part of the draft we prepared to apply the concept of peace journalism, as an analytical framework for assessing media response and as a fund of options for editors and reporters concerned to avoid the shortcomings evident in the coverage of the events Caplan relates – shortcomings so amply documented in many contributions to this book.

But this fell foul of IMPS’ director, Keith Spicer, a former newspaper editor and television regulator from

Canada. “The purpose of journalism is nothing more than to seek meaningful facts”, Spicer thundered, in an email quoted in our book, *Peace Journalism*, which we use in the Conflict-Resolving Media course.

There’s a problem here. How are journalists to decide which, of the practically infinite number of facts out there, waiting to be reported, they should deem to be ‘meaningful’? Especially if a determined effort is underway, by governments (journalists’ usual sources) to play down those facts and divert attention from them – as was the case here? Surely editors and reporters must be prepared to start out with their own ‘toolkit’ for analysing and reporting conflict, preferably one attentive to some of the insights into conflict and peace that we study here in CPACS? That’s exactly what peace journalism seeks to provide.

Without such a scheme, any effort to remedy the media failings discussed in this book will be doomed to fall short. Its editor, Allan Thompson, is a former reporter with the Toronto Star newspaper and now a journalism professor, also in Canada. He’s done a sterling job in pulling this material together – which must have been akin to herding cats – but his own final chapter, purporting to make recommendations for future changes, is among the weakest parts.

His call to journalists to take seriously their “responsibility to report” is welcome, as far as it goes – and he furnishes us with suggestive metaphors such as the “deep shadow” around the edge of the news agenda. But, as he himself admits, this is a longstanding lament - that shocking situations do not always receive the attention they deserve. Without a deliberate creative strategy to wean themselves off the usual range of sources, the agenda followed by journalists will continue to overlap, to a great degree, with that of governments and big business – and they may have their own interest in keeping the dark corners of the world in darkness.

## A Life Enhancing Way of Thinking

*Stuart Rees’ review of Anthony Burke’s Beyond Security, Ethics & Violence, Oxford, Routledge, pp 284*

Here is a book with a complicated title, but a rich content. Here is a book which might be considered difficult but which will reward those who persist. The reward lies in digesting the alternatives to being preoccupied with security, with sovereignty and with excluding those who do not fit into conceptions of the alleged efficient State.

Long before the arrival of the war on terror, politicians, military men and media commentators took for granted the idea that various forms of militarism - how to use power in an aggressive top down manner - were the way to run affairs of state. This way of thinking has been exaggerated following 9/11 and has given us Islamic and Christian fundamentalists, Guantanamo, Abu Graib, Baxter, and Villawood. These abuses of human rights are justified with the argument that liberties should be subordinated to the interests of one powerful sovereign parent, the State. Any temptation to think that fair go Australia does not fit this mould, should be resisted. In terms of freedom of the press, Australia was placed 35th by Journalists without Borders and in terms of the international league table ranking countries’ preparedness for peace, Australia was 26th.

Security-dominated perspectives have generated the idea that citizens’ identity is to be maintained by punishing and excluding ‘the other’.

The destructive consequences of this militaristic and allegedly democratic way of thinking can be seen in the disaster of Vietnam, in the cruelty of successive military-led Israeli governments and in the current catastrophe of Iraq. About Vietnam, Robert MacNamara, a chief architect of that war, confessed ‘We were wrong. We were terribly wrong’. In Israel, the building of the Wall is the most telling example of a sovereignty being

sustained without ethical constraints. The late Israeli political scientist Tanya Reinhart wrote, “It is not just Palestinian life that does not count in Israel, those in the military sect have no reservations about sacrificing their own people.” In Iraq, the citizens of that benighted country have become mere pieces in the strategic puzzle in which Bush, Blair and Howard have tested their rationalistic, security-dominated views.

There is an alternative to these centuries of destructive behaviour by state leaders. By travelling beyond violence, beyond assumptions about physical security, Anthony Burke traces the values and skills of an ethical peace which would make the protection of innocent lives a universal principle. Such a peace would bolster the UN and humanitarian law and would develop an international co-existence of relationships of mutual dependence and responsibility.

With impressive scholarship, Burke assembles a team of previous advocates of an ethical peace, beginning with Immanuel Kant and his vision of a ‘perpetual peace’ built on a republican constitution and principles of universal hospitality which abolish the need to resort to war. Robert Oppenheimer a leader of the Manhattan Project is in the same team. He warned against the idea of killing as a matter of calculation, a form of rationalism which he said was against the activity of thought itself. An ethical peace also demands that, in Foucault’s terms, we find a life enhancing freedom which has nothing in common with America’s obsession with promoting its own story as the version of freedom.

There is poetry and optimism in this very important book. A security available to all lies in the values of non violence as expressed in that humanitarianism which fuels the thoughts of poets. A poetry of life and for life could never be conjured by rationalism, by seeking advantage let alone by full blown militarism. The pacifist poet William Stafford must have anticipated all the warmongers who still think that the future lies

in the good, technically-sophisticated democratic men - seldom women - winning a war against bad, mostly primitive insurgents and those soft, somewhat feminine human rights activists who so often hinder the efficiency of a State. Stafford wrote, "Sometimes commanders take us over and they try to impose their whole universe, how to succeed by daily calculation. I can't eat that bread."

Stafford does not appear in this book but other poets do. Under Tony Burke's humanitarian baton they form alliances with numerous scholars. Together they imagine a future dependent on ways of thinking which reject the destruction and cruelty of the past, the mindlessness of military adventures as well as of terrorism in the present. This ethical peace project is worthy of study. The vision in this invaluable book outlines the project's goals and the details of how to attain them. Read on.

## Hans Blix in Sydney

By Jaime Koh

He stood out as one of the few dissenting voices amidst increasing American and British pressure for action against Iraq.

He refused to give in to calls for more damning language in his report to the UN Security Council to swing the votes against Iraq.

He was among the first few who publicly declared the war on Iraq illegal. Despite the barrage of criticisms and ridicule levelled at him, he stood his ground.

He is Dr Hans Blix, chairman of the Weapons of Mass Destruction Commission and Sydney Peace Prize recipient for 2007.

The Peace Prize jury chose Dr Blix for his "principled and courageous opposition to proponents of war in Iraq, for life long advocacy of humanitarian law and non violence and for leadership of disarmament programs to rid the world of weapons of terror".

Sydney Peace Foundation Director, Professor Stuart Rees, said the choice of Dr Blix as this year's recipient "reminds us of the illegality of the Iraq war...He reminds us that a pack of lies were systematically told to justify the armed intervention in Iraq."

The Swedish diplomat still maintains that Washington and Britain had used political spin to justify the war. In the run up, Dr Blix had insisted that there was no clear evidence that the Iraqis possessed weapons of mass destruction. That message, however, ran counter to what the US wanted.

"They wanted invasion," he said. The Americans were "witch-hunters", said the Swede. "They wanted to see anything as evidence that the Iraqis had weapons of mass destruction."

"We were simply looking for the truth. We didn't assume that they had them. We didn't assume that they did not have them," Dr Blix said.



*Hans Blix, Chairman of the Weapons of Mass Destruction Commission*

The Foundation's Chairman Mr Alan Cameron AM said: "It is highly relevant that in this 10th anniversary year of the Sydney Peace Prize, the jury focussed on universal disarmament as a major peace issue and chose one of the most

significant campaigners against the manufacture and possession of arms of all kinds."

Dr Blix has a long career in campaigning against the proliferation of WMD. During his time in the Swedish foreign ministry, he was a member of the Swedish delegation to the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva from 1962 to 1978 until his appointment as the Swedish Minister for Foreign Affairs.

During his 16-year tenure as Director General of the International Atomic Energy Agency (1981 to 1997), Dr Blix was in charge of overseeing inspections of Iraq's nuclear program.

In 2000, then UN Secretary General Kofi Annan called Dr Blix out of retirement to be chair the United Nations Monitoring, Verification and Inspection Commission (UNMOVIC). He held position of Executive Chairman until 2003.

Since then he has been chair of the Weapons of Mass Destruction Commission (WMDC), an independent body based in Stockholm with the mandate to "seek to identify desirable and achievable directions for international cooperation" on issues related to WMDs.

Dr Blix will deliver the City of Sydney Peace Prize Lecture on 7 November at the Sydney Town Hall. Former Australian Prime Minister, The Honourable Paul Keating, will present the Sydney Peace Prize to Dr Blix on the following evening in an Award Ceremony and Gala Dinner at the Great Hall, University of Sydney.

**TICKETS FOR THE CITY OF SYDNEY PEACE PRIZE LECTURE ARE NOW ON SALE AND CAN BE BOOKED ONLINE AT [WWW.TICKETEK.COM](http://WWW.TICKETEK.COM) OR CALL 132 849. FOR BOOKINGS AND ENQUIRIES ABOUT THE AWARD CEREMONY AND GALA DINNER, PLEASE CONTACT THE SYDNEY PEACE FOUNDATION AT [SPF@ARTS.USYD.EDU.AU](mailto:SPF@ARTS.USYD.EDU.AU)**

## Hope rings out in voices of protest

Jake Lynch

It's time to unplug from the Matrix. Consider all the things you think you know about the world today and ask yourself how you know them. Start with World War II - a triumph for the military power of the Allies, led by the US, right? Well, only partly. The US president Harry Truman greeted news of the end of the war in Europe with the words: "General Eisenhower informs me that the forces of Germany have surrendered to the United Nations."

Eisenhower later succeeded Truman in the White House, and warned that the historic achievement of defeating fascism was in danger of being subverted by the "military-industrial complex". The UN Charter effectively made war illegal - establishing a system for regulating world affairs based explicitly on moving away from the principle of "might is right". Of course, that doesn't necessarily suit the mighty, especially when they set out to convince the rest of us that they have right on their side.

At that time, the early 1960s, the Cold War threatened to turn hot, with the Bay of Pigs crisis in Cuba. It never did, of course - because both sides accepted the theory of deterrence, underpinned by the prospect of mutually assured destruction, should the missiles ever leave their silos. Or did they? Actually, that's another myth, held in place by our collective acquiescence. NATO's policy of "flexible response" was an early example of spin - a euphemism for plans to fight and "win" a nuclear war with Moscow, however batty that now seems.

At least the Cold War kept the peace, I hear you cry. We now live in a much more dangerous world than we did when non-violent protest saw off state communism. Gareth Evans, then Australia's foreign affairs minister and now head of the International Crisis Group, told us "with the end of the

Cold War, there is far more scope for co-operation in the prevention and resolution of conflict. But the irony is that there are now many more disputes, conflicts and crises calling out for such attention."

This, too, is at odds with the facts. The launch document of the Global Peace Index, based at Sydney University, opens with a graph showing the incidence of all forms of conflict in the world. The lines are fairly steady till 1990, when they all turn sharply - down. It's time to put away our nightmares, wake up and smell the coffee.

In a few weeks, the fume-filled caverns of Sydney's central business district, where the action sequences of *The Matrix* were filmed, will host the visit of the US President, George Bush. At street level - coffee level - dissenting voices will be raised, protesting against the world's biggest military machine and its commander-in-chief.

These are the people who tried valiantly to alert us to the idiocy of Operation Talisman Sabre, the biggest military exercise on Australian soil, which has just taken place in Queensland and the Northern Territory, involving as many as 20,000 US troops and 7500 Australians and featuring simulated urban warfare in what's officially dubbed a "culturally non-specific" mock town. No wonder Defence won't tell us where it's supposed to represent. There's no country on Earth where Australia's interests are better served by invading alongside the US than by playing to our traditional strengths of UN peacekeeping and diplomacy.

Only while still plugged in to the Matrix

can we really accept that "terrorist plots", which have taken the place of red scares in official demonology, have nothing to do with the mess we are making in the Middle East. It's absurd to say suicide bombers have to be from impoverished backgrounds if their actions are to be interpreted as a response to injustice; absurd because it ignores the psychic structure of relations laid down from the Crusades, through colonialism and the betrayals Arab peoples - and Iran, for that matter - have suffered from the West over the past century. And, as Voltaire said, those who can persuade us to believe absurdities can persuade us to commit atrocities.

So, remember, when you see news pictures of activists being carted off by robocops guarding delegates to the APEC summit, their dissent from the official line is keeping alive the prospect of peace - a prospect so many have struggled for, in World War II and Cold War, before and since. They, in short, are the guardians of democracy and the hope of a safer world that we could now create.

THIS ARTICLE APPEARED IN *THE SYDNEY MORNING HERALD* ON FRIDAY JULY 20TH. ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR JAKE LYNCH DEVELOPED THESE ARGUMENTS FURTHER IN HIS PUBLIC LECTURE 'PROMOTING DISSENT, REVIVING DEMOCRACY', AT THE OLD GEOLOGY LECTURE THEATRE, ON MONDAY JULY 23RD, TO MARK THE TENTH GIVING OF THE SYDNEY PEACE PRIZE. THE EVENT WAS HOSTED BY THE DEAN OF ARTS, PROFESSOR STEPHEN GARTON. THE FULL TEXT OF THE LECTURE IS AVAILABLE FROM CPACS AS AN OCCASIONAL PAPER, PRICE \$6.00.



Jake Lynch, Director CPACS; Alan Cameron AM, Chair, SPF; and Stephen Garton, Dean, Faculty of Arts, at the SPF 10th anniversary lecture. Photo by Mike Otterman

## Paths to Justice and Prosperity: West Papua 2007

This was the name of the conference organised by the West Papua Project of CPACS in close coordination with the activist NGO, Indonesian Solidarity, earlier this month. Held over two full days, Thursday 9 – Friday 10 August at the Wool Room, International House, Sydney University, it attracted 15 listed speakers, including ten Papuans and five Australian academic experts. Attendance topped at nearly 100, including several of the 43 boat refugees from Papua granted temporary protection in April last year. The speakers included a small team of leaders from Tongoi Papua, the new all-Papuan trades union which in April this year organised a successful strike for a big improvement in wages and conditions at the giant Freeport copper and gold mine, in addition to a group of AusAID funded HIV workers from Papua who are currently studying and touring in Australia and Papua New Guinea as Australian Leadership Award Fellows.

Other Papuan speakers represented a wide range of experience and expertise—churchmen prominent in human rights organisation and politics, and several currently active political exiles from more than one part of the Papuan political spectrum.

The state of human rights in Papua and the impact of the Indonesian government's Special Autonomy deal for Papua since 2001 were the chief focus of the conference. Keynote speakers Agus Alua, chairman of the MRP (Majelis Rakyat Papua) the all-Papuan upper house of the provincial legislature), and J. Budi Hernawan, the ethnically Javanese Director of the Office for Justice and Peace of the Diocese of Jayapura (Sekretariat Keadilan dan Perdamaian, SKP) outlined some serious shortcomings of Special Autonomy so far—

- failure to consult the MRP or Papuans generally about splitting the province in two (with more splitting to come) and doubling the number of regencies (districts), thus aggravating the problem of ...
- corruption—by local elected provincial and district officials (mostly Papuan), nullifying any benign effect of the trillions of rupiah (hundreds of millions of dollars) which have poured into the province under Special Autonomy, based on Jakarta's taxation of multinational resource company revenues in Papua;
- an acute health and education crisis resulting from this failure of governance, including the highest rate of HIV cases in Indonesia, abysmal infant and maternal mortality and (among other human resource deficits) a near complete lack of young educated Papuans able to meet AusAID's English language requirements for winning scholarships to Australia.
- an accelerating military build-up and police/military pressure on the Papuans, especially in the highlands. Of particular concern is a new military commander of the Jayapura region, Col Siagian, still under UN indictment for crimes against humanity in East Timor, who has not only sworn to 'crush' and/or 'destroy' 'separatists', now effectively defined as anyone who presses for social, political and historical justice for Papuans, but who is also engaged with other officers in creating 'false OPM' (Papuan freedom movement) guerillas and Red and White (patriotic Indonesian) militias as well as an alternative (ie, spurious) Papuan tribal council as an answer to the genuine one which rejected special autonomy in 2005.

It became clear at the conference that Agus Alua and the MRP are key to successful resistance against militarisation in Papua.

Many speakers called for the opening up of Papua to foreign journalists and

observers — while Richard Chauvel of Victoria University outlined his experience of a good governance seminar in the highlands capital, Wamena, at which he was forbidden to speak by police intervention, despite an invitation from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the local bupati (regency chief).

Jim Elmslie of the West Papua Project surveyed the steady growth of the Indonesian settler population in Papua to suggest that the Papuans are in danger of becoming a minority in their own land with serious political and cultural implications for their survival, while Clinton Fernandes of the University of New South Wales (ADFA), in commenting on the recently concluded Australian-Indonesian security cooperation treaty, demonstrated that the Australian government had not always been aligned with Jakarta to oppose 'separatism' in Indonesia—not only supporting Dutch efforts to bring Papua to independence in the 1950s but also US efforts to assist rebellions in the outer islands over the same period.

Paula Makabory of ELSHAM Papua human rights NGO, co-founder of the Institute for Papuan Advocacy & Human Rights, Byron Bay, and member of the Steering Committee of the West Papua Project, is currently in exile in Melbourne. She argued strongly against the view of fellow (PNG-based) exile Franz Albert Joku that special autonomy was "the only game in town" for Papuans and that therefore Papuan exiles should organise to support it. Paula believes the current military build-up in Papua (from three to six battalions) has made implementation of Special Autonomy and protection of human rights almost impossible and argues for international pressure on Jakarta to change its so-called security approach.

Finally, at a special session on the HIV pandemic in Papua and the issue of violence against women led by David Wambrauw, Director of Yayasan Harapan Ibu (Mother's Hope Foundation), Jayapura, and an independent researcher, Domingaas Nari, a strong connection was made between the epidemic, the violence and

military repression and illegal business activity in the context of the social and economic marginalisation of Papuans.

**[PAPERS FROM THE CONFERENCE WILL BE AVAILABLE SHORTLY ON THE WEST PAPUA PROJECT HOME PAGE IN THE CPACS WEBSITE.]**

*Peter King, Convener-West Papua Project*

## Taming War — why I wrote it

I can't remember when I first heard about the Centre for Peace and Conflict Studies. It would have been well over twenty years ago in the 1980s.

CPACS in those days was small but dynamic. It's now a great deal bigger, just as dynamic and with a formidable program of research and teaching. Although in no way could I call myself a scholar of peace studies, I've been much inspired by CPACS. I've even written a book called *Taming War*.

In the 1980s, peace was not my central interest. So how did I come to write the book?

For many years I was absorbed by educational technology – the idea of using technology like radio and television broadcasting, slides, films, videos and latterly even computers, to spread knowledge more efficiently and cheaply around the world.

In the early 1990s, for various reasons, I moved on. Ironically, the digital revolution soon established the kind of technology I and many other 'educational technologists' had always dreamed of – powerful, reliable, flexible and amazingly inexpensive.

My personal revolution took place at about the same time. At a day's notice I joined CARE Australia's advance medical team and flew to Zaire to work with Rwandan refugees. I'd heard much about war, seen the photos and films and read the books. This was the first time I had seen the bodies – hundreds and hundreds of them lying beside the road to the refugee camp. Most of the

victims had perished of cholera. True, they had not been killed deliberately, but their death and the misery of those who survived was the result of war.

A week or two after I arrived, I had to visit the border post near the town of Goma where hundreds of thousands of refugees had recently entered from Rwanda. The ground was almost completely covered with their scattered discarded belongings – basketware, cooking pots and clothing. The smell of the camps – wood smoke and decay – was as strong here as ever – a smell of death. It was infinitely depressing. War did not seem clever or romantic. It just seemed grey and dismal – and horrible. I think it was here that *Taming War* really began.

I felt a strong need to work out for myself why people went to war and why it had gone on for so long and why it was still happening in 1994. And I also wanted to explore some solutions. Could we find other ways?

Coming back to Australia and making contact once more with CPACS, I realised that many other people, were on the same journey, looking for better ways of resolving conflict. (Most of them had realised where they were going much more quickly than me and hadn't had to detour through Central Africa!)

After a while, I started writing and I started reading. CPACS was invaluable in making me aware of contemporary theory and practice in peace studies.

I realised that I had a huge amount of catching up to do in the mainstream of peace studies. But from my background in biology and my interest in technological

innovation, perhaps I could bring some new perspective.

The process of writing and then rewriting was a journey of exploration in itself, as I tried to clarify and express my findings.

As for biology, the book certainly seemed to go through a process of evolution. I trust that it's mostly the fittest ideas that have survived.

What is the message of *Taming War*? I'll try to summarise it in one sentence.

"We may be able to develop solutions to the problem of war by looking at our biology and then putting into practice those amazing technological and communication skills that got us into trouble in the first place."

Since I stood at the border post at Goma in 1994 – almost exactly 13 years ago – I've thought a good deal about the problem of war. If nothing else, writing *Taming War* has clarified some of those ideas. Over that same period, more and more people have become involved with CPACS and their combined expertise, as well as their achievements to date, is awesome indeed.

This makes me confident, that whatever else it does (assuming that a few people in CPACS read it!) the book is very likely to stimulate some more suggestions about what we can do to tame war.

**'TAMING WAR- CULTURE AND TECHNOLOGY FOR PEACE' IS PUBLISHED BY PEACE POWER PRESS. RRP \$25 (WWW.TAMINGWAR.COM). IT IS AVAILABLE TO STUDENTS AND OTHER MEMBERS OF CPACS AT THE SPECIALLY DISCOUNTED PRICE OF \$20 (WHICH INCLUDES A DONATION TO CPACS).**



*At the Operation Talisman Sabre demonstration (photo by Alex Bainbridge, Green Left Weekly) Aust's New Peace and Security Agenda*

## Glebe Books Launch



Ian Bickerton (left) and Mike Otterman (right) at Glebe Books (photo by Jaime Koh)

A lively discussion on aspects of war and torture, chaired by Stuart Rees, was held at Glebe Books on 14 March. Two authors, Michael Otterman, visiting scholar and previous student of the Centre for Peace and Conflict Studies, The University of Sydney and Ian Bickerton, visiting research fellow in history at UNSW, discussed their books, *American Torture: from the Cold War to Abu Ghraib and Beyond* and *Unintended Consequences*, the United States at war, respectively.

## A United Nations Emergency Peace Service

### TO PREVENT GENOCIDE AND CRIMES AGAINST HUMANITY

Despite a need to move quickly to prevent genocide and crimes against humanity, the United Nations has no reliable capacity to do so. Genocide in Rwanda illustrates this incapacity, as do the massive killings of innocent people in Cambodia, the former Yugoslavia, East Timor, Sierra Leone, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Liberia and Sudan.

The time has come to create a permanent UN Emergency Peace Service (UNEPS) to ensure that 'Never Again' will there be genocide or crimes against humanity.

CAPCS, in partnership with Caritas Australia and a New York-based network of over 35 organisations, Global Action to Prevent War, has recently embarked on an ambitious research and advocacy project concerning the creating of a United Nations Emergency Peace Service (UNEPS).

### WHAT IS UNEPS?

The UNEPS proposal, crafted by a group of prominent international academics and activists was launched last year by Sir Brian Urquart, former UN Under Secretary General for Special Political Affairs.

A permanent UN Emergency Peace Service would:

- move to quell an emergency within 48 hours after United Nations authorisation;
- individually recruit and train 12,000 to 15,000 personnel, including civilian police, military, judicial experts and healthcare professionals;
- have gender, ethnic and religious balance;
- complement – not replace – other national, regional, and United Nations efforts with its 'first in, first out' capabilities;
- preserve the non-intervention principle that upholds sovereign and independent states. Only in exceptional circumstance, when civilians are threatened with genocide or crimes against humanity, does UNEPS maintain that intervention is required.

Juan Mendez, Special Adviser to the UN Secretary General on the Prevention of Genocide called it "a bold, politically realistic proposal for establishing a rapid deployment service".

Over the next two years, Stuart Rees and Annie Herro will be interviewing leaders—political, military, religious, and academic—to explore what would hinder and facilitate the creation of UNEPS.

To find out more about this project, contact Annie Herro on [aherro@usyd.edu.au](mailto:aherro@usyd.edu.au) or visit her in room 104 of the Mackie Building.

## From Marrickville to Bethlehem \*\*

This twinning nurtures sanity in opposition to mayhem, a gesture for humanity for little town of Bethlehem.

Once holy place of vestaments, of shepherds' lands and picnic banks now strangled by the settlements sustained by mercenaries and tanks.

For human rights please stand in droves

and summon courage to be tall against the theft of olive groves against that sacrilegious wall

Which separates and treats like stone the people who, let's make it clear, should be surrounded, left alone by sharpening the wedge of fear.

But being twins can nullify that military monologue that force of arms disqualifies the precious means of dialogue.

And so the Council sees the prize of reaching out and finding will to share and talk not demonize, Congratulations Marrickville.

Stuart Rees June 17th 2007

\*\* on occasion of Marrickville Council moving on June 19th to twin with Bethlehem