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The Centre for Peace and Conflict Studies was established in May 1988 as a specialist research, teaching and advocacy centre within the University of Sydney, pursuing its objective of peace with justice by as wide a variety of means as possible.

CPACS promotes interdisciplinary research and teaching on the causes of conflict and the conditions that affect conflict resolution and peace. Research projects and other activities focus on conflict resolution with a view to attaining peace with justice.

CPACS promotes the development of an extra-curricular lecture and seminar program in peace and conflict studies for the University and the community at large, the organisation of conferences, and the arrangement of programs for visiting specialists in peace and conflict studies and research. It also liaises and cooperates with other centres and institutions working in the field of peace and conflict studies.

The Centre aims to facilitate dialogue between individuals, groups or communities who are concerned with conditions of positive peace, whether in interpersonal relationships, community relations, within organisations and nations, or with reference to international relations.
President’s Report

Dr Ken Macnab, President

The year 2011 at CPACS was successful in all the major areas of activity, but increasingly demanding on the time, skills and good will of all concerned. Pressures on full-time teaching staff in terms of workloads, space shortages, finances and administrative duties increased noticeably. The contributions of Honorary Associates and part-time lecturers, volunteers, administrative staff and students continued to be vital. Nonetheless, the Centre continued to achieve high academic performance standards (and profitability to the University) as well as conducting its affairs collegially and contributing significantly to advocacy and public debate.

During the year, a Strategic Review of the School of Social and Political Sciences proposed that, for a host of rather nebulous reasons, CPACS should seek to amalgamate with the departments of either Government and International Relations or Sociology and Social Policy. The reasons advanced included points such as ‘taking better advantage of critical mass in research and teaching’, ‘providing better support to staff and students’ and ‘lifting the public profile’ of certain relevant areas. These reasons were not considered persuasive by anyone at CPACS, particularly in view of the facts that CPACS already achieves highly in all the areas identified, and does much more besides. Moreover, CPACS is distinctive in terms of its establishment by the University, its Constitution, its Council, its projects on West Papua and Sri Lanka and the Refugee Language Programme, its independence, the range of its activities, and the contribution of Council members, volunteers, casuals and students.

At the CPACS Council meeting in November, these matters were extensively canvassed. It was agreed that the achievements of the Centre derived significantly from its independence and distinctive culture. The extent to which the Centre is already interdisciplinary, has scholarly and other links within the School and beyond, and has flexible cross-listing arrangements for students, was emphasized. It was also agreed that the current location of the Centre in the Mackie Building had contributed to its character and success. A resolution was passed unanimously as follows:

CPACS Council is not persuaded by the case made in the SSPS Review for the amalgamation of the Centre with another Department, expresses grave concerns for the future independence, creativity, activism and scholarly excellence of the Centre, and requests that the current location of an independent CPACS within the School of Social and Political Sciences be maintained.

Letters to the Dean of Arts and others in the Administration communicating these views and outlining various perspectives on the history, character and performance of CPACS were written by Jake Lynch (as Director), Stuart Rees (as former Director, current Director of Sydney Peace Foundation) and myself (as President). Meetings have been held with the Head of School. The opinions of CPACS supporters have been well aired. The processes are still proceeding.
The ‘A-team’ in the office this year consisted of Juliet Bennett, until her departure overseas and replacement by Punam Yadav, and Neven Bondokji. They continue the CPACS tradition of competence, courtesy, easy communications, coping under pressure and tolerance of idiosyncratic colleagues. Among the volunteers, Librarian Peggy Craddock deserves special mention for determination and dedication. I also wish to thank Vice-President Erik Paul for stepping in with aplomb while I was overseas. The academics and others include the full-time academic staff of Director and Associate Professor Jake Lynch, Senior Lecturer Dr Wendy Lambourne and Lecturer Dr Lynda-ann Blanchard, assisted by a motley crew of Honorary Associates and part-time lecturers including Erik Paul, Frank Hutchinson, Peter Herborn, Garry Trompf, Stuart Rees, Abe Quadan, Lucy Fiske, Sandra Phelps and myself. The Gordon Rodley Prize was won by Henry Lebovic and the Cheryl Minks Prize was won by Donna Mulhearn; congratulations to both for their achievements in the Master of Peace and Conflict Studies.

Finally, the Refugee Language Programme requires particular mention. With Lesley Carnus as the part-time Coordinator, and a dedicated staff of 20-25 highly qualified volunteer teachers, the RLP has for years provided a much valued English language service to refugees on bridging visas. Its professionalism, quality and friendliness have brought great credit to the University of Sydney and added much to the community engagement of CPACS.

Funded through the Vice-Chancellor of the day, as a result of an initiative of the University Senate in 2004, the RLP is now in dire straits. A decision of the Vice-Chancellor in 2011 to pass authority for the RLP to the Dean of Arts and Social Sciences, without accompanying funding, has been followed by a recent decision by the Dean that the Faculty does not have funds available for its continuation.

This is a deplorable outcome. Efforts are being made to find alternative or temporary funding; without it, the RLP will cease to operate at the end of February 2012.
‘Not everything that counts, can be counted; and not everything that can be counted, counts’.

It’s a remark attributed to Albert Einstein, and a useful corrective to the neo-liberal institutional governance that continues to tighten its grip on so many areas of life.

Nowhere is this more apparent than in Australian universities, which have laboured under successive bean-counting exercises to compare numbers of ‘research outputs’. The drive to quantify and monetise academic endeavour is informed by a pessimistic view of human nature – the ‘rational actor’ model, which assumes that each of us is out to maximise our personal returns in exchange for minimum exertion. Elaborate systems of surveillance must be devised, therefore, to ensure that we don’t ‘get away with it’. This is especially urgent in the public sector, which is not explicitly motivated by profit. How much more bracing conditions must be in private enterprise, with no ‘cushion’ between their successes – and failures – and the discipline of the markets.

It’s the doctrine known in Australia as ‘economic rationalism’, and Canberra’s clumping attempts to extend it to academic scholarship come, with a sense of dreary predictability, just as its shortcomings have been ruthlessly exposed in the one arena – international finance – where it might be supposed to be a particularly good ‘fit’.

Alan Greenspan, a ‘High Priest’ of free-market capitalism as former Chairman of the US Federal Reserve, professed himself ‘astonished’ in the wake of the Global Financial Crisis that bank managers' own instincts for self-preservation (or preservation of their institutions, which proved not to be the same thing) did not deter them from taking wildly excessive risks.
There have to be areas of public life and the public sphere where we can go to take positions vis-à-vis market systems and behaviours, and inspect them from the outside. On one level, that means government-imposed discipline for banks in the form of reserve and transparency requirements. On another, it means regarding intellectual endeavours, such as scholarly research, as good in themselves, and accepting that, while they cannot be counted, they still count.

Neither can the quality of such activities be gauged by recording the number of times a particular article is quoted by others, as some have suggested: it may simply encourage groupthink, along lines that are misguided and misleading. Recall, once again, the Global Financial Crisis, which the Economics profession singularly failed to predict or warn against. Why was this? A question put by Her Majesty the Queen (yes, really) on a visit to the London School of Economics a couple of years ago. The answer, according to a pair of senior academics deputed to draft a reply to Buckingham Palace: ‘most were convinced that banks knew what they were doing and believed that the financial wizards had found new and clever ways of managing risks… It is difficult to recall a greater example of wishful thinking combined with hubris’.

It is odd, therefore, to find senior academics here at the University of Sydney seemingly quiescent in the remorseless spread of these logics. Our work will be increasingly ‘benchmarked’, they are inclined to intone; that is ‘clearly the way things are going’. Not for the first time, one wishes the same critical analysis routinely applied to the subject matter of academic colleagues’ research could be turned on such pronouncements: they would surely be denounced as a deceitful disavowal of ‘political agency’, serving to ‘naturalise’ what were once deemed unacceptable and alien nostrums.

To have us all running like hamsters on a wheel, producing and counting ‘outputs’, can only prevail, as a definition of our function as academics, in default of a sense of purpose clearly articulated with reference to our role as public intellectuals. Not wishing to be presumptuous, I will confine myself to putting forward a few pointers in our own area of the social sciences.

The political and media discourses that make up Australia’s ‘official public sphere’ contain several default positions that should be seen as an affront to social science. The so-called ‘war on terrorism’, for instance, is underpinned by a proposition that the phenomenon of violence by non-state armed groups should – in words attributed to Richard Perle, a neoconservative guru who took a senior backstage role in the Bush Administration – be ‘decontextualised’. ‘Any attempt to discuss the roots of terrorism is an attempt to justify it’, Perle continued. ‘It simply needs to be fought and destroyed’.

This is the thinking that has led Australia into ill-fated military adventures in Iraq and Afghanistan, in the face of public opposition (all along, in the first case; latterly, in the second). We social scientists need to find ways to raise to public and political salience
the underlying structural and justice issues implicit in conflicts, to enable and encourage creative thinking about more effective responses. And the grotesque abuses of asylum seekers arise from rival attempts to exploit the issue as a ‘political spectacle’, diverting public attention away from wider issues of distributive justice. Social scientists need to take on the job of contesting representations of asylum seekers as a ‘problem’, requiring a ‘solution’ (Pacific; Malaysian) – not waste their time producing articles no-one is going to read, purely and simply to meet ‘benchmarks’ imposed by government bureaucrats.

**CPACS’ record**

I make this case from a position of strength. No-one can accuse CPACS of ‘special pleading’ in arguing for the importance of research ‘hits’ to be downgraded in assessing the worth of university activities.

Figures published in 2011 show the Centre was responsible for some 14% of the counted outputs in the previous year’s HERDC return for the School of Social and Political Sciences (HERDC being the Higher Education Research Data Collection exercise) – despite having just some 3% of the full-time academic staff.

These were all well integrated with other aspects of our work. *One People, One Soul* – the book by CPACS Visiting Scholar John Ondawame – extended the advocacy and research agenda of our longstanding West Papua Project, which has played a key role in drawing attention to the need for peace with justice, while the default response by ‘official Australia’ prefers to sweep it under the carpet.

My own book, *Reporting Conflict: New Directions in Peace Journalism*, co-authored with Johan Galtung, added fresh impetus to a global campaign for change (see my report on Peace Journalism research in 2011, elsewhere in this Annual Report, for an update). It will not be until mid-year that the collection for 2011 will be finalised, but there is every reason to anticipate another strong showing, and one that will – again – have emerged organically, as it were, from CPACS’ range of activities.

The year ended with the Centre’s future clouded, under a plan to incorporate it into either one of two larger Departments – of Government and International Relations, or Sociology and Social Policy, respectively. In contesting this unwelcome proposal, we have drawn attention not only to CPACS’ status as the top-performing unit of the School – as measured by research outputs – but to its record of public engagement and advocacy. In a sense, the need is for the rest of the University to become more like CPACS, not the other way round. Too many colleagues are too content to ‘keep their heads down’ in their books, and to regard social science (to stick with the same field) as something that can be safely confined to desks in offices.

The report that contains the recommendation for CPACS to merge with a larger Department also puts forward the aspiration, on behalf of social science at the
University, for ‘Greater effort to engage with public and private institutions that use and produce social science research’.

As I pointed out in my response, there can be few other units in the entire University that engage more with the community at large than CPACS, and this engagement takes place at a variety of different levels, from formal partnerships (as with ARC Linkage) through regular consultations and briefings of MPs, agencies and NGOs, and civil society groups, to collaboration in offering our vibrant program of public events.

This broad range of public engagement is symbolized by – though by no means confined to – my own contributions to public media, as the Centre’s Director. In 2011:

1. November 4, New Matilda, ‘Australia out in the cold on Israel’
2. October 22, *Sydney Morning Herald* News Review, ‘Answer to the question: should war veterans reconcile with former enemies?’
5. September 15, New Matilda, ‘A Media Inquiry Should Get the Facts Straight’
6. August 4, Crikey, ‘War Crimes in Sri Lanka and Political Options for Australia’
9. April 7, Crikey, ‘Chewing up the Greens over BDS’,
10. April 3 Galus Australis, ‘Time to shine a light on Israel and Palestine’,
    [https://www.engagemedia.org/Members/NewsGoo/videos/](https://www.engagemedia.org/Members/NewsGoo/videos/)
12. March 21, News Goo, Vodcast offering critical analysis of Australian TV news and current affairs, with guests John Pilger, Hannah Middleton and Antony Loewenstein, in partnership with New Matilda
    [https://www.engagemedia.org/Members/NewsGoo/videos/](https://www.engagemedia.org/Members/NewsGoo/videos/)
All these outputs arise from a culture, developed over the years in CPACS, of commitment to peace with justice, in our own interpersonal relations no less than in our teaching, research and advocacy. It is that culture that new students, visiting scholars and others enter, and one in which they feel supported to produce valuable work, with significance both within and beyond the academy. It is a culture that cannot be counted, but it does count.
Dr Ken Macnab, President

Peace with Justice

As a prologue to an account of CPACS activities the Annual Report has usually provided a sketch of national and international affairs that have a bearing on our objective of peace with justice. As usual, in order to provide some depth, and because they are glaring examples of serious global problems and issues, I have chosen to concentrate on particular themes and subjects. I would also add that these views are my own, not the authorised views of the Centre for Peace and Conflict Studies, to the extent that such views exist.

Globalisation, Inequality, Injustice and Protest

Globalisation, inequality, injustice and protest are inextricably linked, and 2011 was the year when these links were manifested most publicly and widely. The effects of globalisation as a set of economic policies have exacerbated existing injustices and created new ones, and generated powerful social, economic, political and cultural tensions. Inequalities of all sorts have sharpened, not just in relation to material standards of living, but also in access to decent education, life choices, health, happiness and human rights. At the core of all the public protests, demonstrations, resistance movements and uprisings which characterised 2011 lay an awareness of and opposition to injustice and inequality.

The concept of ‘justice’ has a long history, and has always been seen as a virtue of both individuals and institutions. Plato defined it in his Republic (380BC) as both the most essential individual human virtue and the bond which held society together in a harmonious whole. Conversely, ‘injustice’ is the lack of or opposition to justice on both the individual and collective levels, including humanity as a whole. Essentially, injustice means ‘gross unfairness’. Synonyms for injustice frequently carry a negative prefix: unfairness, inequity, unlawfulness, inhumanity, maltreatment, inequality, malpractice, misuse, and so on. Like violence, injustice can be generated by personal relationships, institutional procedures, structural frameworks, and cultural discrimination. Hypocrisy and corruption in all walks of life are potent creators of injustice. The ways in which criminal justice systems work - political and vested interest inputs, laws, police, courts and punishments - can generate both justice and injustice. Violations of individual and collective human rights are always injustices. As are grossly unequal treatment and rewards in the workplace, both as individuals and as participants in national and global economic systems.

Unmerited inequality, created by structurally imposed discrimination, is one of the most keenly felt injustices. Such unjust inequality lies at the core of modern economic
practice, which treats people as factors of production to be bought and sold as commodities rather than as human beings with inalienable rights. On trips to Iceland in the 1870s, William Morris, the creative English revolutionary socialist, fell in love with its strange, ever-changing landscape, scene of the great sagas he would imitate, and its traditions of craftsmanship. But he also learnt there a fundamental political axiom, that 'the most grinding poverty is a trifling evil compared with the inequality of classes'. Economic inequality, often quantified as 'wealth and income differences', has a clear impact on life opportunities and outcomes. President Barack Obama has called it 'the defining issue of our time'. In their book titled The Spirit Level: Why More Equal Societies Almost Always Do Better (2009), epidemiologists Richard Wilkinson and Kate Pickett compared eleven significant indices of health and social development in 23 of the world's richest nations and in the individual US states. They concluded that in terms of physical health, mental health, drug abuse, education, violence, imprisonment, obesity, social mobility, community trust, teenage pregnancies and child well-being, outcomes for the overwhelming majority of people were significantly worse in more unequal rich countries and states.

The significance of such studies is strengthened because they reveal patterns across the type of economy that is proliferating worldwide. The idea of a unified world is an old one, which spread rapidly after the First and Second World Wars. But the humanitarian ideals of the League of Nations Covenant (1919), the UN Charter (1945) and Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948) and many other Agreements and Conventions were accompanied by global economic institutions such as the International Monetary Fund (1945), the World Bank (1945) and the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT 1948), later becoming the World Trade Organisation (WTO 1995). These have promoted the economic interests and policies of the victors of both the Second War and the Cold War. Accompanying them has been the creation of the myth of universal benefits, by people such as Marshall McLuhan, who popularised the term Global Village (1962), and Theodore Levitt, a Harvard Business School marketing economist, who from the early 1980s promoted the benefits of 'globalisation'.

However, despite all the boasts about the benefits of the increasingly global relationships of culture, ideas, communications, languages and peoples, they are primarily the servants of economic globalisation. This is essentially the ideology of unregulated self-interest, facilitated by reduced international barriers and regulations, dominated by the free marketing of finance, goods and services. It is the latest packaging of capitalism, which has had many champions and slogans: classical orthodox political economy (Smith, Malthus and Ricardo), 'laissez-faire' and 'free trade' (Cobden, Bright and the Manchester School), imperialism, economic liberalism, 'trickle down economics' (Thatcher and Reagan), triumphant 'liberal democracy' (Fukiyama) and 'economic rationalism'. But the supposedly self-evident axioms of globalisation are actually self-serving platitudes. Because it serves their interests well, in the last few decades globalisation has been embraced by the leaders and elites of an increasing number of nations, such as South Africa, Russia, Mexico, India, Malaysia, Thailand, the Philippines
and South Korea. A Swiss Economic Institute even puts out the KOF Index of Globalization, which measures and ranks 'the economic, social and political dimensions of globalization.' But there is increasing evidence that globalization delivers its benefits inequitably, and that the gap between the rich and poor is widening everywhere.

The plethora of statistics documenting these trends can only be sampled briefly here. According to the World Top Incomes Database from the Paris School of Economics, between 1980 and 2008 the share of total household income in the United States accruing to the top 1% rose from 10% to 21%, and that of the top 10% rose from 34.6% to 48.2%. To quote Saul Eslake: 'Put simply, the top 10 per cent of Americans control almost half the country's household wealth.' In the same period, the average real incomes of the bottom 90% rose by just 2%. All other indicators, such as gross incomes, taxation percentages, stocks and shares value, and property ownership, indicate vast and widening inequalities, particularly since the Global Financial Crisis. Statistics for other countries, such as Britain, Sweden, India, Australia, even China, though moderated in some cases by progressive taxation rates, welfare redistributions and other transfer systems, show the same growth of inequality and the same deleterious consequences. In an article on the worldwide Occupy movement, Saul Eslake concluded:

... the fact the economic gains from the policy agenda pursued, to varying degrees, around the world over the past three decades have accrued so disproportionately to upper income groups has undermined political acceptance of (let alone support for) the key elements of that agenda - including deregulation of markets, reductions in barriers to cross-border trade and investment, and lower rates of corporate and personal income tax.

In short, globalization sharply increases the injustice and inequality it claims to reduce.

The links between globalisation, injustice and inequality were highlighted in 2011 by worldwide protests. There has been much speculation about possible common denominators between 'popular protests' that helped topple regimes in Tunisia, Egypt and Libya, have rattled regimes in Syria, Yemen and Bahrain, and have highlighted grievances in countries as different as Mexico, Spain, Greece, the United States, Russia, England, Pakistan, India and Thailand. The Occupy movement by the end of 2011 boasted protests in '951 cities in 82 countries'. Compared with the widespread protests of the late 1960s, what stood out in 2011 was the breadth, variety and depth of protests, the range of grievances, the global media coverage, and the determination and courage of the protesters. This was acknowledged when Time chose 'THE PROTESTER' as its 'Person of the Year' for 2011. In his Introduction explaining this choice, Rick Stengel wrote that:

Protests have now occurred in countries whose populations total at least 3 billion people, and the word protest has appeared in newspapers and online exponentially more this past year than at any other time in history.
What also united the protesters was anger about social, economic and political inequality and injustice.

This point was made many different ways. Spanish protesters called themselves Los Indignados (The Outraged) and united under the banner: 'We are not goods in the hands of politicians and bankers.' Veteran Russian human rights activist Lyudmilla Alexeyeva recently branded Vladimir Putin's economic policies as 'capitalism for friends'. Even Sarah Palin has railed against 'corporate crony capitalism' in America, though it’s a strange grievance for her side of politics. The Occupy Wall Street protest movement, which began in mid-September in Zucotti Park in the heart of New York’s financial district, targeted social and economic inequality, mass unemployment, and the greed and corruption enmeshing big business, finance and government. Its slogan, 'We Are the 99%', rapidly became the banner for worldwide imitation. Commenting on this, the 'Occupy Wall Street' website wrote: 'The one thing we all have in common is that We Are The 99% that will no longer tolerate the greed and corruption of the 1%.' Kurt Andersen wrote of the protesters: 'they believe they’re experiencing the failure of hell-bent megascaled crony hypercapitalism and pine for some third way, a new social contract.' The American Dialect Society voted 'Occupy' as the 2011 Word of the Year.

Former Sydney Peace Prize winner Arundhati Roy, visiting Zucotti Park just after it had been cleared by police and then re-occupied in mid-November, made the point: 'We are fighting for justice. Justice, not just for the people of the United States, but for everybody.' She went on to comment on globalisation:

The Indian government worships US economic policy. As a result of 20 years of the free market economy, today, 100 of India’s richest people own assets worth one-fourth of the country’s GDP while more than 80% of the people live on less than 50 cents a day; 250,000 farmers, driven into a spiral of death, have committed suicide. We call this progress, and now think of ourselves as a superpower. Like you, we are well-qualified: we have nuclear bombs and obscene inequality.

Most protests in 2011 challenged not just the outcomes, but the very systems that produced them. As Kurt Andersen wrote in his Time cover story on 'The Protester':

All over the world, the protesters of 2011 share a belief that their countries' political systems and economies have grown dysfunctional and corrupt — sham democracies rigged to favor the rich and powerful and prevent significant change. They are fervent small-d democrats.

Greed, corruption, inequality and injustice, the four horsemen of globalisation, were seriously challenged in 2011. But persistence and courage on a large scale will be necessary in 2012 if peace with justice is to be achieved on any wide scale.
The Marketing of War

Weasel words have invaded the world, with pernicious consequences. The purpose of weasel words (from the belief that weasels suck the yolk from bird’s eggs, leaving an empty shell) is to deprive a word or phrase of meaning and load it with deliberately misleading implications. Their use is well illustrated in Don Watson’s masterly Death Sentence: The Decay of Public Language (2003), his Dictionary of Weasel Words: Contemporary Clichés, Cant and Management Jargon (2004) and the weaselwords.com.au website. For daily samples, try the daily media; the strong of stomach might look up the 'Mission Statement' of their employer. Not even universities are immune from re-branding, hyper-marketing, managerialism, bureaucratese and other such forms of gobbledygook. It is hardly surprising that weasel words are proliferating in the marketing of war.

War and propaganda have always had a symbiotic relationship. A good slogan was itself a powerful weapon. One of the oldest is the Latin saying taken from an Ode by Horace: Dulce et decorum est pro patria mori, usually translated as: 'It is sweet and proper to die for one’s country.' Used widely by the Roman Legions, and on standards during the Thirty Years War (1618-1648), it was refurbished and heavily used in Britain during the First World War (1914-1918). It had been inscribed on the wall of the chapel of the Royal Military Academy Sandhurst in 1913. So widely was it preached and propagated that Wilfred Owen, in his powerful anti-war poem, Dulce et Decorum Est, written just months before he was killed one week before the war ended in 1918, referred to it bitterly as 'The Old Lie'.

A constant and striking component of war propaganda was 'atrocity stories', alleging abominable behaviour by opponents. During the First World War (also called the Great War), Britain excelled not only at patriotic and religious propaganda, but at the invention of atrocity stories, the most infamous being the story of the German Corpse Factory. This war highlighted the truism: 'In war, truth is the first casualty'. Often attributed to Aeschylus, the Greek dramatist who fought at the Battle of Marathon, and to various other sources, its first recorded use was by Arthur Ponsonby, in his Falsehood in Wartime: Propaganda Lies of the First World War (1928). In reality, truth about war is rare, before, during and after.

In the twentieth century, the marketing of war expanded well beyond wars themselves to the political campaigns justifying the deliberate use of military violence against chosen enemies. The Nazis and Fascists made war central to their identity. The Cold War saw plenty of violent interventions, both overt and covert, around the world, invariably justified as defending core values. Probably the most sophisticated and systematic recent war marketing campaign was that leading up to the American-led invasion of Iraq in 2003, well analysed by Sheldon Rampton and John Stauber, in their Weapons of Mass Deception: The Uses of Propaganda in Bush’s War on Iraq (2003). Similarly, the role of war reporting, by correspondents specifically and the media in general, has been co-
opted into the marketing strategy. The Gulf War of 1991, as well as being the first war in history televised in real time from start to finish, also reached new heights for electronic deception and audience manipulation. With the Iraq War came the ‘embedding’ of journalists and photographers with active units. As Lt. Col. Rick Long of the U.S. Marine Corps commented, 'Frankly, our job is to win the war. Part of that is information warfare. So we are going to attempt to dominate the information environment.'

A growing part of this ‘information warfare’, often waged primarily against domestic targets, is the careful naming of military operations. Towards the end of the First War, offensives on both sides were named from religious, medieval, and mythical sources. Occasional Second World War campaigns were given evocative names, such as Germany's Operation Barbarossa and the Allied Operation Overlord, for publicity purposes. These contrasted with the code names meant to be kept secret or mislead, such as 'Little Boy' and 'Fat Man', the two atomic bombs dropped in Japan. After the war, according to Lieutenant Colonel Gregory C. Sieminski, in a short piece on *The Art of Naming Operations* (1995), the US War Department created a new category of unclassified operation names, known as 'nicknames', for 'administrative, morale, and public information purposes', in relation to atomic bomb testing. During both the Korean and Vietnam Wars, some American commanders invented aggressive and inspirational operation names, primarily for the purposes of boosting morale among their own troops.

Somewhere along this path, the decision was made that single-word names were code, meant to be kept secret, while double-barrelled adjective/noun combinations were for propaganda purposes. Starting in the 1970s, the US Joint Chiefs of Staff (JCS) implemented naming guidelines and a computer software system called the 'Code Word, Nickname, and Exercise System', shortened to NICKA. In Sieminski's view, calling the US invasion of Panama in 1989 ‘Operation Just Cause’ was 'the first US combat operation since the Korean War whose nickname was designed to shape domestic and international perceptions about the mission it designated.' Not everyone was impressed. A *New York Times* editorial called 'Operation High Hokum' an 'overreach of sentiment'. Several years later one critic called this attempt to portray a 'blatantly unjust invasion' as a 'morally righteous cause' a case of 'blatant propaganda' and 'an extremely cynical gambit'. Nonetheless, the marketing of war by the calculated nicknaming of operations has become standard American military and political operating procedure. In 2011 'Operation Odyssey Dawn', the mission in Libya, set new standards in obfuscation.

Such marketing is not confined to America, and has a long history in some countries. In a very impressive study of 239 names of Israeli military operations (76) and weaponry (163) used between 1948 and 2007, Israeli lecturer on culture and communication, Dalia Gavriely-Nuri concluded that ‘perhaps the main purpose of military naming’ is ‘the subtle inculcation of positive attitudes toward the use of violence’. Writing in the journal *Armed Forces and Society* in 2009, she analysed the phenomenon of 'annihilative naming strategies', whereby the use of military violence was sanitised, normalised and shielded
from scrutiny. In the naming of Israeli military operations, 38% used names and concepts from the Bible, and 27% used names and concepts from nature. Using names from the Bible, which most Israelis study for at least ten years, implied that these operations continued Biblical leadership, promises and commands. Operation ‘Homat Magen’ (Defense Wall), for example, was the massive attack in West Bank cities in 2002. Many names from nature (such as Operation Snow, the 1982-5 invasion of Lebanon) framed the use of force as ‘a common, normal phenomenon, as if it were an integral part of the natural chain of events’. In general, these naming practices both tapped into and perpetuated a supportive Israeli ‘cultural ethos regarding the use of military violence.’ They also disavowed agency and responsibility by the Government and IDF.

This method of marketing war has become prominent in the West. Operation Desert Storm has become synonymous with the First Gulf War of 1991, while Operation Enduring Freedom (originally called Operation Infinite Justice, but changed for P.R. purposes) was the invasion of Afghanistan in 2001. The invasion of Iraq was nearly called Operation Iraqi Liberation (OIL), but became simply ‘Operation Iraqi Freedom’. In September 2010 the war in Iraq was renamed ‘Operation New Dawn’. Announcing the news the previous February, Defense Secretary Robert Gates said in brilliant Orwellian Newspeak:

> Aligning the name change with the change of mission sends a strong signal that Operation Iraqi Freedom has ended and our forces are operating under a new mission.

Even the word ‘mission’ reeks of self-justification and self-righteousness. But the fashion is ubiquitous, although the results aren’t always propitious. The NATO bombing of Yugoslavia in 1999 was called Operation Allied Force (OAF). The Russian military campaign repelling Georgia from South Ossetia in 2008 was called ‘Operation Forcing Georgia to Peace’.

Closer to home is Exercise Talisman Sabre, the biennial joint Australia-United States military exercises carried out since 2005 in Northern Australia. The military claim there is no symbolic significance in the name; Australia provided the first word, the US provided the second. Obviously, however, since a talisman is ‘an object supposedly endowed with magic powers’ and a sabre is ‘a heavy cavalry sword with a one-edged, slightly curved blade’, the exercise name embodies the national military ethos of the participants. The point of all these operational names is that they are marketing exercises. They are simply part of the armoury of weapons of mass deception deployed against the public. They imply that war and violence are normal, legitimate, necessary and praiseworthy, when in most cases none of these claims is true.
The Israeli-Palestinian Peace Process

The Israeli-Palestinian ‘peace process’ has been going on for more than sixty years. There have been accords and agreements, memorandums of understanding and exchanges of letters, protocols and procedures, milestones and road maps, preconditions and secret reservations, outside facilitators and honest brokers, and extensive negotiations, both public and secret. But there has always been far more ‘process’ than ‘peace’, more rhetoric than reality, more political propaganda than good faith. Middle-East specialist Henry Siegman has called it ‘the most spectacular deception in modern diplomatic history.’ The bankruptcy of the whole process was highlighted in January 2011 with the release to al-Jazeera and the Guardian of the so-called Palestine Papers. The French-Palestinian lawyer who leaked them, Ziyat Clot, had been a PLO adviser in negotiations during 2008, but had resigned in disgust. When he publicly justified his actions in January 2012, he said:

The ‘peace negotiations’ were a deceptive farce whereby biased terms were unilaterally imposed by Israel and systematically endorsed by the US and EU. Far from enabling a negotiated and fair end to the conflict, the pursuit of the Oslo process deepened Israeli segregationist policies and justified the tightening of the security control imposed on the Palestinian population, as well as its geographical fragmentation.

Moreover, even the terminology of the ‘peace process’ is deceptive. It is loaded with weasel words (stripped of meaning but filled with misinformation), dog-whistle phrases and coded signals, which destroy its value. In a recent pioneering study in the online journal Discourse and Society (September 2010), titled ‘The Idiosyncratic Language of Israeli ‘Peace’: A Cultural Approach to Critical Discourse Analysis (CCDA)’, Israeli academic Dalia Gavriely-Nuri subjected this core phraseology to critical analysis. She focused on the ‘cultural code’ and the ‘discursive strategies’ embedded in the rich Israeli peace dialogue. Using initially 60 entire speeches by three Israeli Prime Ministers (Barak, Sharon and Olmert) between 2000 and 2007, she found two ‘dominant characteristics’; the persistent linking of ‘peace’ with a partner, creating a ‘peace phrase’, and repetition of the metaphor ‘we extend a hand in peace’. She then expanded the sources to include debates in the Knesset since 1987, and, in relation to ‘the metaphor’, other Knesset sources, the three main Israeli daily papers (from the 1990s) and the electronic Palestinian press, autobiographies by Israeli leaders, and other relevant material. She tabulated the frequency of ‘peace phrases’ and ‘the metaphor’, and analysed them in terms of their distinctively Israeli meanings and their impact on the peace process.

Gavriely-Nuri found that ‘the Israeli peace discourse includes a windfall of terms: ‘full peace’, ‘partial peace’, ‘cold peace’, ‘regional peace’, ‘just peace’, ‘stable peace’, ‘safe peace’ and more.’ The phrase ‘peace and security’ was ubiquitous. She categorized these peace phrases on a binary axis as either a supportive peace discourse (in three aspects:
Positivity, Concreteness and Bilateralism) or an oppressive peace discourse (Negativity, Abstractness and Unilateralism). Analysis of the 16,512 dominant peace phrases in the Knesset protocols from the early 1980s on, for example, found that Positive (9%) was outweighed by Negative (17%), Concrete (15%) was dwarfed by Abstract (53.5%), and Bilateral (1.7%) was less than half the Unilateral (3.8%) phrases. In other words, ‘peace’ in the Israeli peace discourse was presented as false, unreal, unjust, violent or risky rather than as beneficial, in vague terms such as ‘hope’, ‘desire’ and ‘seeking peace’ rather than in real institutional frameworks, and in terms that focused on Israeli perspectives without reference to others.

In short, Gavriely-Nuri concluded that there was ‘semantic vagueness surrounding the term peace’, which turned it into ‘a black box or, more precisely, into an attractive but empty box.’ This ‘semantic void’ facilitated its loading with ‘semantic, cultural and political cargoes’, to the extent, for example, that ‘talking about peace within the Israeli peace discourse often serves as a fig leaf to hide or legitimate the initiation of military actions, including wars.’ Her conclusion was that:

Application of the CCDA to Israel’s political peace discourse revealed that use of the term in this discourse served two purposes: first, the construction of the Israeli speaker’s positive self-image as a peace-seeker together with delegitimation of rivals; and second, the facilitation of public acceptance of strategically problematic actions, primarily use of military violence, by their presentation as part of the peace discourse.

Analysis of the mythic Israeli metaphor ‘we extend a hand in peace’, first articulated in The Declaration of the Establishment of the State of Israel (1948), and used in almost every major speech of an Israeli leader since, revealed that over time this became code for one side, Israel, perpetually extending the hand of peace, but ‘the other’, the Palestinians, consistently rejecting it. In Gavriely-Nuri’s view, this ‘complemented the myth that all Israeli wars were ‘no-choice wars’ - the Israeli version of just war - caused not by Israel but by the Palestinians.’ Moreover, the metaphor was often linked to a threat, as when Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin responded to a Palestinian terror attack in 1994: ‘Our hand is always extended in peace but its fingers are always on the trigger.’

The concept of ‘semantic void’ loaded with deceptive meaning applies broadly to the whole Israeli-Palestinian relationship. Use of legal institutions, terminology and processes as part of the control of Palestinians and expansion of Israeli presence in the Occupied Territories is notorious, and, as Gavriely-Nuri noted, deserves similar analysis. As a final comment, in reference to use of the word ‘borders’, she pointed out that the commonly preferred Hebrew word was the supposedly neutral ‘line’, so that:

the Israeli border lexicon includes ‘armistice line’, ‘ceasefire lines’, ‘green line’, ‘purple line’, ‘blue line’ and others, together with obviously political phrases such as ‘secure borders’, ‘recognized borders’, ‘defensive borders’ and so forth.
Moreover, most of the participants in and promoters of the Israeli-Palestinian peace dialogue share the self-interested propaganda-laden phraseology and patent lack of good faith and honesty. The much trumpeted return to the negotiating table by Israeli and Palestinian officials in January 2012, in Amman, Jordan, in the first public meetings for the two parties in over a year, illustrates this. A spokeswoman for their promoter, the United States, said: ‘We are encouraged that they are both coming to the table, that they’re talking directly. We think that’s the best path forward.’ But Israel refused in advance to participate if Hamas was represented, the Palestinians insisted they would not formally negotiate until Israel agreed to halt the construction of settlements in the West Bank, and Israelis responded that they would not accept this. In short, the peace process has no positive objectives, and simply serves not very well hidden ulterior agendas.

Other aspects of the Israeli-Palestinian relationship over 2011 illustrate the underlying duplicity and lack of good faith. In March the United States vetoed a moderate United Nations Security Council resolution strongly supporting the Israeli-Palestinian peace process, reaffirming previous UNSC resolutions on the illegality of Israeli settlements on Palestinian land occupied since the 1967 War, and calling on Israel to cease additional settlement expansion. The fourteen other SC members supported the resolution. Despite all its points being long-standing US positions, it was vetoed because the US (following Israel) feel the Security Council has no role in settling the problem. US Ambassador Susan Rice stated, 'the only way to reach that common goal is through direct negotiations between the parties.' As Stephen Zunes wrote at the time:

> Obama’s insistence that resolving the conflict over Israel’s illegal settlements should be restricted to bilateral negotiations assumes symmetry in power and legality in the two sides that doesn’t, in fact, exist.

In April Judge Richard Goldstone, who chaired the UN Human Rights Council’s four-member inquiry into the conduct of the Gaza War of 2008-9, published a personal reconsideration of the so-called Goldstone Report. It had found strong evidence of possible war crimes and 'possible crimes against humanity' by both Israel and Hamas, and recommended that both sides conduct open investigations of their conduct. This had infuriated Israel, in particular because it impugned the image of the IDF, boasted in Israel as 'the most moral army in the world'. Israel launched a massive anti-Goldstone campaign to discredit both Goldstone and the Report. In his April 2011 piece, Goldstone wrote that evidence brought out since, particularly in the Israeli military investigations of over 400 allegations of IDF operational misconduct, had led to second thoughts. Hamas, he pointed out, had done nothing. Of a number of qualifications of his original stance, the most striking was that the Israeli inquiries ‘also indicate that civilians were not intentionally targeted as a matter of policy.’ This is disingenuous, to say the least. The Report showed clearly that among several possible war crimes, the Israelis had used white phosphorus illegally and indiscriminately, had deliberately targeted Gaza
infrastructure, public buildings, and civilian refuges, and that insufficient effort had been made to protect civilians. Moreover, as Judge Mary McGowan Davis, current Chair of the UN Committee of Independent Experts monitoring the post-Goldstone process, reported, Israeli investigations were far from independent or thorough, were incomplete, and no investigations into the actions of those who designed, planned, ordered and oversaw the operation appeared to have started.

Goldstone's Reflections re-ignited the controversy. Israel claimed vindication and demanded that the UN repudiate the Report and apologise. The three other eminent members of the original inquiry responded sharply to these 'aspersions', pointing to 'personal attacks and the extraordinary pressure placed on members of the fact-finding mission' and stating that those criticisms had 'misrepresented facts in an attempt to delegitimise the findings'. Most scholarly commentators endorsed and expanded on these views, pointing out that neither Israel nor Hamas had addressed the bulk of the Report’s findings, and that the original charges still stood. Political commentators were divided, most being critical of Goldstone's Reflections and Israel's stance, many simply following the Israeli Government line.

The constant war of weasel words waxed and waned. Early in May, the signing in Ramallah of a reconciliation agreement between Fatah and Hamas was hailed in the West Bank, the Gaza Strip and refugee camps in Lebanon. But the Israeli Prime Minister reiterated blanket rejection of participation by Hamas in the political process, including elections and negotiations, and said the accord was 'a tremendous blow to peace and a great victory for terrorism'. Benefits for the Palestinians began to flow from the popular overthrow in February of Egyptian President Mubarak, with the caretaker government announcing in May the permanent reopening of the Rafah crossing with Gaza. Israel's official response was that the move violated signed agreements and may be illegal. One commentator in the Israeli media wrote that the Israel-Gaza area of the Sinai was becoming a refuge for 'all the lepers of the Arab world including al-Qaeda, global jihad, the Muslim Brotherhood'.

Towards the end of May the American and Israeli leaders put on a political Punch and Judy show. President Obama gave a much-hyped speech in praise of the pro-democracy movements across the Middle East, saying that this was an historical opportunity for negotiation between Israelis and Palestinians. He made a heavily qualified call, involving 'mutually agreed land swaps', for Israel’s withdrawal to its 1967 borders. Obama was flayed in the media, particularly by right-wing and pro-Israel sources. Prime Minister Netanyahu's visit shortly thereafter was confrontational, both in private in the White House and in a speech to a joint session of the US Congress. Grossly simplifying Obama's stance, Netanyahu flatly rejected a return to 1967 borders, the prospect of Jerusalem becoming a shared capital and any return to Israel of Palestinians ejected from their homes when Israel was created in 1948. For good measure, Netanyahu restated demands that the Palestinian Authority totally reject Hamas and officially recognise Israel as a Jewish state.
Obama stood firm, pointing out to the annual conference of the American Israel Public Affairs Committee that he had been misrepresented, and assuring them that: 'By definition, it means that the parties themselves - Israelis and Palestinians - will negotiate a border that is different than the one that existed on June 4, 1967.' US-Israel public relations mellowed slightly. The Palestinians were, as usual, the biggest losers. The chief Palestinian negotiator, Saeb Erekat, labelled Netanyahu's speech a 'public relations address', and added: 'Talking about peace under Netanyahu's terms is a waste of time.' Nabil Rudeina, a spokesman for the Palestinian President, Mahmoud Abbas, stated 'peace must be based on international law and negotiations, and not preconditions and obstacles to the peace process'.

In June, as another flotilla aiming for Gaza assembled, Israel's Government Press Office issued a statement (produced in Prime Minister Netanyahu's office) warning that foreign journalists who joined the flotilla faced 'being denied entry into the State of Israel for 10 years' as well as 'the impoundment of their equipment and additional sanctions'. Condemnation was universal. The Foreign Press Association of Israel stated: 'We urge the government to reverse its decision immediately.' A Foreign Ministry source commented: 'For a Prime Minister that prides himself on sophisticated hasbara (public relations), this was a clumsy error.' But in August the hollow 'peace dialogue' was back in evidence. Briefly, it emerged that Netanyahu was prepared to accept a border formula using the hated phraseology of '1967 line'. But the preconditions were that the Palestinian Authority ceased its unilateral pursuit of statehood at the United Nations, scheduled for September, and accepted Israel as a Jewish state. Saeb Erekat commented: 'When I hear this from Netanyahu's lips that he will accept an Israeli state along 1967 borders, I will believe it.' He added, 'What I have read so far is a masterpiece of PR and linguistics.'

At the UN General Assembly in September, theatrics from many leaders, including those from Iran, Israel and the Palestinian Authority, prevailed. Mahmoud Ahmadinejad of Iran presented his usual rant. Prime Minister Netanyahu presented a history lesson, dire warnings about Iran, and the standard Israeli peace discourse. He said Israel wanted 'genuine peace', and praising the former Arab leaders Anwar Sadat and King Hussein of Jordan for their 'courage' in forging diplomatic ties with Israel. 'Every time an Arab leader truly wanted peace, they got it', Netanyahu said. 'If the Palestinians truly want peace, we will make peace.' He made reference to 'my vision of peace', praised his frequent and courageous offers of peace, continued despite rebuffs, and condemned the Palestinian approach to the UN for recognition: 'The Palestinians should first make peace with Israel, and then get their state.' Netanyahu stated: 'Ladies and gentlemen, I continue to hope that President Abbas will be my partner in peace. I've worked hard to advance that peace.' Unfortunately, Netanyahu's Coalition government is heavily dependent on right-wing and ultra-Orthodox political parties that simply reject the establishment of a viable Palestinian state.
As he intended, President Mahmoud Abbas made an impassioned plea to the General Assembly for international recognition of a Palestinian state:

The time has come for my courageous and proud people, after decades of displacement and colonial occupation and ceaseless suffering, to live like other peoples of the earth, free in a sovereign and independent homeland.

The Palestinians, represented by the Palestine Liberation Organisation (PLO), currently have permanent observer entity status at the UN. Abbas formally requested consideration of recognition by the Security Council. President Barack Obama, however, told Mr Abbas that the US would use its UN Security Council veto to block the Palestinian bid. Israel and the US say a Palestinian state can only be achieved through talks with Israel, not through UN resolutions. In a futile postscript, the Middle East Quartet (the United Nations, Russian Federation, United States, and European Union), founded in 2001-2 to facilitate the ‘peace process’, cobbled together a statement of yet another timetable for negotiations leading to a Palestinian state within twelve months, and promised their earnest best efforts to that end.

This Palestinian push for an alternative avenue of progress was furthered in late October with a renewed bid (first made in 1989) for admission to full membership of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation. Ironically, the Obama administration strongly supports both UNESCO and full Palestinian membership, but is bound by laws dating back to 1990 and 1994 mandating a complete severance of US financing of any UN agency which accepts the Palestinians as full members. UNESCO gets some 22% of its budget from the US. Despite United States objections, UNESCO’s 58-nation executive board approved the Palestinian application. In the subsequent vote, from 194 member states, 173 votes were cast (some states were unfinancial and/or absent), and the Palestinian Authority was granted full membership of UNESCO, with 107 vote in favour, 14 against (including Australia, Canada, Israel, Sweden and the US) and 52 abstentions. One key Palestinian request will be for the recognition of about twenty potential world heritage sites, including the Church of the Nativity in Bethlehem. Wrangling about finance continues.

Since a large part of Israeli public relations is about image and identity, it is interesting to note how domestic issues tend to be faced only when they tarnish that image. For some years tensions have grown in Israel as the ultra-Orthodox Jewish communities and political parties have asserted their views. There have been increasingly violent clashes in Jerusalem and elsewhere over Saturday activities, public dress and behavior and the presentation of women in advertising. The ultra-Orthodox population of the town of Beit Shemesh, west of Jerusalem, have erected street signs calling for the separation of genders on the sidewalks, dispatched “modesty patrols” to enforce a chaste female appearance, and hurled stones at offenders and outsiders. International attention was focused on the town in late December, with film posted of a group of ultra-Orthodox Haredi Jewish men spitting and screaming at a weeping eight-year old schoolgirl on her
way to school, because of her dress. Exposed arms were apparently the issue. According to the BBC, a group of 300 rock-hurling Haredim greeted the police force that arrived in Beit Shemesh a few days later, ostensibly to tear down signs such as those demanding separate sidewalks for men and women, but primarily as a response to public outrage in Israel and overseas.

This incident re-focused attention on religious and cultural tensions. Another incident involving a young Israeli female soldier, boarding a bus not far from her military base, being accosted by a man who demanded she move to the back of the bus. When she refused, she was called a whore, and others joined in insulting her. The bus stopped, the man was arrested, much publicity ensued. The incident highlighted the growth of so-called 'mehadrin' bus lines, which mostly run in and/or between major Haredi population centres, in which gender-segregation and other ultra-Orthodox rules are applied. Female passengers sit at the back, and enter and exit through the back door; males sit in the front part and use the front door. Created in the late 1990s for the Haredi public in Jerusalem and elsewhere, other bus companies gradually came to agreements with the ultra-Orthodox Mehadrin Council, a Union of rabbinic Authorities with power to certify products and services. By early 2010 more than fifty transportation companies ran 'mehadrin' buses.

Such incidents highlight government inaction. As a result of petitions and protests going back years, and interminable Ministry of Transport inquiries and recommendations, in January 2011 the High Court of Israel ruled that gender segregation was illegal. It ordered that signs designating buses as segregated were to be removed and new signs be put up informing passengers that they had the right to sit wherever they wanted, and stressed that neither passengers nor the driver could pressure anyone into complying with a segregated seating arrangement. These were to be the conditions of a one year experiment to see whether a voluntary segregation system could function. Clearly it has failed. But the Netanyahu's Government is in an awkward position. His coalition is heavily dependent on ultra-Orthodox political parties, such as Shas (an acronym for Sephardic Torah Guardians) and United Torah Judaism. The ultra-Orthodox make up only 10% of the population of Israel, but are growing in both numbers and influence. Sergio DellaPergola, a Professor of Demography and Jewish History at the Hebrew University in Jerusalem, has called them the 'decisive 10 percent'. Netanyahu said in parliament that Israel was 'a liberal western democracy' (despite also demanding recognition of Israel as 'a Jewish state' or 'homeland for the Jewish people'), that the state would act against 'anyone who harasses women, anyone who harasses people in the public sphere', and that the 'public sphere is open and safe and will remain so'. But, as with the peace process, will government words speak louder than action?
The War on Terrorism

The ‘war on terror’ has become in the last decade just another weasel phrase - words sucked dry of real meaning, become code for hidden assumptions and agendas. This applies whether it is Australia justifying involvement in Afghanistan, Russian policy towards Chechnya, Israeli treatment of Palestinians or American actions in Pakistan. When abstract notions of justice and truth are invoked - ‘good versus evil’, ‘right versus wrong’ - they are undermined by both sides claiming the same values, and the failure of both to apply the very standards being trumpeted. In a recent article using a cultural approach to critical discourse analysis to examine the embedded codification and discursive strategy of Israeli peace discourse, Israeli academic Dalia Gavriely-Nuri made the point that the rhetoric of the ‘just war’ and the rhetoric of the ‘war on terror’ had become elements of the ‘global dictionary of power and manipulation’. But the rhetoric and strategies of the West’s war on terror are both hypocritical and grossly counter-productive, not least because they perpetuate the unacceptable proposition that ‘one man’s terrorist is another man’s freedom fighter’. While genuine grievances undoubtedly promote terrorism, and understanding of the reasons for terrorism is crucial, the proposition that ‘the end justifies the means’ is self-defeating as a moral basis for peace with justice.

The human rights violations committed in the name of the war on terror continue to taint international relations. In April 2011 WikiLeaks released nearly 800 military files detailing the outcomes of lengthy assessment processes (including in many cases harsh interrogation techniques) applied between 2002 and 2008 to the 780 people who had passed through Guantanamo. Significant numbers were either innocent Pakistanis and Afghans, often turned in for ‘bounty money’, and low-level participants of little value or danger. A Human Rights Watch Report in July, titled Getting Away with Torture: The Bush Administration and Mistreatment of Detainees, assembled the accumulating evidence (some provided by their recent memoirs) that American leaders ordered illegal treatment of detainees. The Report said:

Based on this evidence, HRW believes there is sufficient basis for the US government to order a broad criminal investigation into alleged crimes committed in connection with the torture and ill-treatment of detainees, the CIA secret detention program, and the rendition of detainees to torture.

Among those named were the President, George W. Bush, Vice-President Dick Cheney, Defense Secretary, Donald Rumsfeld, and CIA Director, George Tenet. HRW says it ‘expresses no opinion about the ultimate guilt or innocence of these or other officials’, but is merely presenting the evidence of alleged war crimes and urging action. Knowing that such action is not likely in America, HRW urges other countries to pursue investigations and possible prosecutions under the doctrine of ‘universal jurisdiction’. This process (used, for example, by Britain and Spain against Augusto Pinochet) has already started in some European countries. Among issues for future examination are
likely to be the American use of unmanned drones to kill suspects in various countries and the killing of Osama bin Laden, Israeli targeted assassinations in the Occupied Territories and overseas, and the violations committed by Russia in Chechnya, the Sri Lankan Government in its war with the LTTE and the Chinese in Tibet and Xinjiang.

The death of bin Laden in May, during a secret attack by Navy SEALs on a compound in Abbotabad in Pakistan, sparked a wave of triumphalism in American. ‘Justice has been done,’ President Obama said. ‘Today’s achievement is testament to the greatness of our country.’ He added: ‘The death of bin Laden marks the most significant achievement to date in our nation’s efforts to defeat al Qaeda.’ But the killing and the rhetoric reminded many commentators that the universality of human rights and the rule of law were easily overturned by exceptionalism and expediency, and ran the risk of turning ‘justice’ into yet another weasel word. As conflicting versions of what happened appeared, Professor Nick Grief, an international lawyer at Kent University, said the death had the appearance of an ‘extrajudicial killing without due process of law’. Moreover, the location of the compound and the conduct of the operation placed Pakistan’s military and security agencies in the spotlight, and highlighted the hypocrisy on both sides of the necessary but nasty Pakistan-American alliance in the war on terror.

The undercurrent of Islamophobia which has become a feature of the war on terror had a particularly striking upwelling in 2011. Pastor Terry Jones and his wife, Sylvia, leaders of the Dove World Outreach Centre, ran a long and cleverly marketed Anti-Islamic hate campaign, with the usual titillating drip-feed of Facebook, Twitter, newsletters, e-mails, YouTube clips, press releases, radio plugs and TV items. It started in 2010 with plans to burn Korans on the ninth anniversary of September 11, 2001. Aborted under protest, the campaign revived in 2011, with the announcement of an ‘INTERNATIONAL BURN THE KORAN DAY’ in March, following a mock trial at which the Koran was accused of ‘inciting murder, rape and terrorist activities’ and being ‘under suspicion of the direct or indirect murder of millions of people around the world.’ Following the ‘guilty’ verdict, the Koran was ceremoniously soaked in kerosene for an hour and burned on a barbecue grill. All this was streamed live online and promoted on Facebook. Outrage was widespread, Jones received over 300 death threats, and following condemnation by President Karzai, a mob attacked a United Nations compound in the northern Afghan city of Mazar-i-Sharif, killing seven UN employees. General David Petraeus, Commander of the US-led International Force in Afghanistan, deplored the burning and stated: ‘Obviously it’s an additional serious security challenge in a country that faces considerable security challenges.’

The United Nations leadership was shaken at the irrationality and violence of the attack, but was determined to remain in Afghanistan. In standard even-handed mode, President Obama strongly condemned both events:
The desecration of any holy text, including the Koran, is an act of extreme intolerance and bigotry. However, to attack and kill innocent people in response is outrageous.

But the Pastor and his wife believe they understand the will of God, and said they were considering putting the prophet Muhammad 'on trial' at their next 'day of judgment'. Dr. Jones is also the author of the treatise *Islam is of the Devil* (2010) and sole source vendor of the spin-off products - 'Islam is of the Devil' t-shirts, baseball caps and coffee mugs. Religious bigots and racists of all countries and denominations feed off this sort of extremism and respond in kind, given licence by the war on terror.

The whole mentality of using ‘war’ to combat ‘things’ is flawed. But it prevails and is ever more widespread. Some uses appear innocuous - war on poverty, prices, acid rain and so on – but most uses involve campaigns based on force and violence. There are ‘wars’, declared and undeclared, against terrorism, drugs, refugees, asylum seekers, itinerant workers, border crossers, and inhabitants of occupied territories, fought with bullets and barbed wire, walls and barriers, processing camps and detention centres. They all deny human rights and civil liberties, and destroy rational public debate with weasel words and vituperation.
Peace and Conflict Studies – Academic Program (Coursework)

Dr Wendy Lambourne, Postgraduate Coursework Coordinator

Staff

The Centre's three full-time academic staff and team of part-time lecturers, tutors and administrative assistants support a highly successful academic program comprising higher degree research, postgraduate coursework and undergraduate teaching.

CPACS Director, Associate Professor Jake Lynch, continued in 2011 to coordinate the Distance Masters program as well as teaching the postgraduate units Conflict-Resolving Media in Summer School with Ms Annabel McGoldrick, and Political Economy of Conflict and Peace with Professor Frank Stilwell of the Department of Political Economy in first semester. He also coordinated the core unit, Key Issues in Peace and Conflict Studies, in Winter School. In second semester Jake coordinated the new postgraduate unit of study, Information Interventions in Conflict, and took over as Postgraduate Research Coordinator during Dr Lynda Blanchard’s sabbatical semester.

Dr Wendy Lambourne continued as Postgraduate Coursework Coordinator and taught United Nations and International Conflict Resolution in first semester; Transitional Justice and Peacebuilding in Winter School; and Conflict Resolution and Peacebuilding in second semester. In first semester, Wendy teamed up with Annabel McGoldrick to offer Peace of Mind: The Psychology of Peace to postgraduate students, and in second semester she supported Associate Professor Judith Keene of the Department of History who coordinated the CPACS undergraduate unit, History and Politics of War and Peace.

Dr Lynda Blanchard coordinated the postgraduate units Nonviolence and Social Change in Summer School and Key Issues in Peace and Conflict Studies in first semester along with the new Koori Centre undergraduate unit on Race, Racism and Indigenous Australia also in first semester. Lynda coordinated the dissertation seminars, continued as Postgraduate Research Coordinator and represented the School on the Faculty Postgraduate Research Committee, before taking special study leave in second semester.

Our impressive team of part-time lecturers and honorary associates in 2011 included Ms Annabel McGoldrick who co-taught Conflict Resolving-Media and Peace of Mind; The Psychology of Peace; Mr Abe Quadan who taught Community Mediation with Dr Spase Karoski; Mr Peter Herborn who taught Peace and the Environment with Professor Frank Hutchinson; Dr Erik Paul who taught Peace and Conflict in Southeast Asia; and Ms Leticia Anderson who taught Religion, War and Peace. We welcomed to the teaching team Ms Lucy Fiske who taught Human Rights, Peace and Justice in first semester and Ms Cammi Webb-Gannon who assisted with coordination of Key Issues in Peace and Conflict Studies in second semester. Emeritus Professor Stuart Rees, Adjunct Professor
Sev Ozdowski, Dr Ken Macnab, Dr Hannah Middleton and Mr Steve Lancken also contributed guest lectures and dissertation supervision. Distance unit coordinators included Professor Johan Galtung, Professor George Kent, Professor Paul D. Scott and Mr Fred Dubee, in addition to Dr Sandra Phelps who taught Human Rights, Peace and Justice online in second semester.

Associate Professor Ahmad Shboul from Arabic and Islamic Studies, Dr Andrew McGarrity from Indian Subcontinental Studies, and Rabbi Dr Aril Lobel from Hebrew, Biblical and Jewish Studies all presented guest lectures in the Religion, War and Peace unit. Guest presenters in the UN unit included Professor John Langmore from the University of Melbourne; former UN Senior Weapons Inspector, Rod Barton; Australian Polisario representative, Kamal Fadel; Major General (Rtd) Tim Ford who is a UN adviser on peace operations; and CPACS PhD candidate Ms Annie Herro. Peace of Mind: The Psychology of Peace featured presentations from visiting Rwandan researcher Dr Charles Mironko, and CPACS research students and graduates Neven Bondokji, Paul Duffill and David Lacey. Guest lecturers in Transitional Justice and Peacebuilding included Professor Leigh Payne from Oxford University, Dr Kiran Grewal from the Department of Sociology and Social Policy and CPACS PhD candidate Mr James Tonny Dhizaala.

During the year, Administrative Assistants Juliet Bennett, Neven Bondokji and Punam Yadav provided invaluable support for the academic program including responding to new student enquiries, organising the printing of course outlines and readers, managing the submission and return of assignments, and organising the student welcome lunches and end-of-semester dinners.
**Undergraduate Program**

In first semester, Dr Lynda Blanchard assisted Ms Lyn Riley from the University's Koori Centre with the coordination of KOCR3201 Race, Racism and Indigenous Australia. The course tutors were Punam Yadav and James Tonny Dhizaala.

PACS2002 History and Politics of War and Peace, taught jointly with the Department of History, had another successful year, with more than 120 students enrolled in the unit which was offered in second semester. Associate Professor Judith Keene from the Department of History coordinated the unit and CPACS PhD candidate, James Tonny Dhizaala, was the course tutor. Guest lectures were contributed by Associate Professor Jake Lynch and Dr Wendy Lambourne; CPACS PhD candidates Leticia Anderson, Annie Herro and James Tonny Dhizaala; and Associate Professor Hans Pols from History and Philosophy of Science.

**Postgraduate Coursework Program**

**Student Enrolments**

Student enrolments in the 23 units of study offered in the postgraduate program in 2011 totalled 484, the lowest level in several years. This was caused primarily by external factors including the global financial crisis, increase in the Australian dollar, and Faculty administrative changes which meant that fewer applicants were admitted directly to the Masters program. Applications for the MPACS program remained strong, and the number of new enrolments in the degree remained one of the highest in the Faculty. We offered a total of 17 different electives in addition to the core unit, Key Issues in Peace and Conflict Studies, and the dissertation and treatise units. The unit PACS6916 Passion, Peace and Poetry was also on the timetable for 2011 but cancelled because the level of enrolments failed to reach the minimum.

However, other units of study continued to attract enrolments of more than 25 students, including Community Mediation; United Nations and International Conflict Resolution; Human Rights, Peace and Justice; Religion, War and Peace; and Conflict-Resolving Media.
**Postgraduate Units of Study 2011**

**Summer School**
PACS6912  Nonviolence and Social Change  
PACS6914  Conflict-Resolving Media  
PACS6928  Community Mediation: Theory and Practice

**Semester 1**
PACS6901  United Nations and International Conflict Resolution  
PACS6903  Peace and the Environment  
PACS6904  Dissertation Seminars  
PACS6911  Key Issues in Peace and Conflict Studies  
PACS6915  Human Rights, Peace and Justice  
PACS6921  Peace of Mind: The Psychology of Peace  
PACS6922  Peaceful Conflict Transformation (online)  
PACS6923  Human Right to Food (online)  
PACS6924  Democracy in the Developing World (online)  
ECOP6019  Political Economy of Conflict and Peace

**Winter School**
PACS6911  Key Issues in Peace and Conflict Studies  
PACS6926  Peace and Conflict in Southeast Asia  
PACS6927  Transitional Justice and Peacebuilding

**Semester 2**
PACS6904  Dissertation Seminars  
PACS6908  Conflict Resolution and Peacebuilding  
PACS6911  Key Issues in Peace and Conflict Studies  
PACS6915  Human Rights, Peace and Justice (online)  
PACS6917  Religion, War and Peace  
PACS6923  Human Right to Food (online)  
PACS6924  Democracy in the Developing World (online)  
PACS6925  Peace and the Global Compact (online)  
PACS6929  Information Interventions in Conflict

A new unit of study, PACS6930 Ethics for a Sustainable Peace, was approved for offering as a new online unit starting in 2012. To be taught by Dr Anita Wenden, the unit will provide participants with an understanding of key ethical challenges presented by the culture of violence, as manifest across a range of concerns such as inequality, environmental degradation and avoidable hunger and disease, and ethical principles for guiding a response to these challenges.

**Theory to Practice**
The PACS postgraduate program embodies a commitment to providing opportunities for students to learn skills and apply theory to practice in their studies and through involvement in the Centre's social justice activities and projects.
In 2011, MPACS students were able to apply to undertake an internship with CPACS as part of their degree. In second semester international student, Amanda Ghahramani, undertook an internship under the supervision of Associate Professor Jake Lynch. Amanda’s project focussed on developing policy recommendations in relation to asylum seekers and refugees in Australia, in an attempt to identify opportunities for CPACS to add a distinctive contribution to advocacy work already underway in the wider community.

A new unit of study PACS6929 Information Interventions in Conflict saw students planning and carrying out their own projects using social media for peace with justice. Highlights included Face 2 Face, a Facebook page linking Australians with stories of asylum seekers gleaned from conversations with people in Villawood detention centre, and sites providing arguments against Australia’s continuing embroilment in Afghanistan, and for greater inter-cultural understanding among the peoples of Thailand, respectively.

In second semester, students in PACS6908 Conflict Resolution and Peacebuilding designed and facilitated a simulated interactive conflict resolution (ICR) workshop focussed on the conflict in Sri Lanka. Students organised the logistics for the workshop, researched and played the roles of conflict participants, and facilitated the workshops. This unit requires intensive teaching, training and coaching support for students, which was provided by the Coordinator, Dr Wendy Lambourne, with the invaluable assistance of Paul Duffill, and training sessions in conflict resolution and facilitation skills run by professional trainers, Steve Lancken and Lea Vanzella.
Following the success of the PACS6928 Community Mediation unit, we are planning to redesign and offer the unit PACS6913 Conflict in Organisations, which has not been taught for several years, in Summer School 2012. Steve Lancken, who is a professional conflict resolution and mediation trainer and Director of Trillium Group consultants, will coordinate PACS6913 with the assistance of MLitt student, Paul Duffill.

**Coursework Dissertations and Treatises**

Students with previous research experience or a Distinction average in their first semester of the MPACS program may choose to complete a 12-15,000 word dissertation as part of their degree. Students who achieve a Distinction average in their MPACS program may apply to upgrade to Master of Letters which entails the completion of a 25-30,000 word treatise. Congratulations to these students for generating some significant research on a range of topics relating to violence, peace and justice.

**MLitt (PACS) treatises completed in 2011:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stephanie Chiu</td>
<td>Beyond the Homeland: Reconciliation, Relationship Transformation and Restorative Justice Possibilities for the Bosnian Diaspora in South Western Sydney, Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yoganaadan Kadirkamu Kandasamy</td>
<td>Post-Conflict Peace Building in Sri Lanka: Role of Government, Tamil Political Parties and the Tamil Diaspora</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MPACS dissertations completed in 2011:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Matthew Coxhill</td>
<td>What is Sustainable? Corporate social responsibility, artisanal fishers and peace with justice in the exploitation of wild fisheries in the Solomon Islands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kristin Erber</td>
<td>Commodification and Conflict: A Critique of Market Theory in Regard to Human Needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexander Gasko</td>
<td>The Baltic States Join the West: How has it affected their Russian-speaking minorities?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa Ghigliazza</td>
<td>DDR Programming for Child Soldiers in Uganda: From Structures of Violence to Sustainable Peace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erik Hof</td>
<td>Parallel Tracks or Sequencing: The International Criminal Court’s Impact on Prospects for Peace in Sudan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yulia Khan</td>
<td>Independent Abkhazia and South Ossetia: To Be or Not To Be? An Analysis of the Prospects for Their Independence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Lebovic</td>
<td>Towards a Coherent Unity of Perspectives On Peace: Burton, Lederach and the Philosophy of Ken Wilber</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natilee McGruder</td>
<td>An Analysis of the Relationships between Economic Incentives and Cultural Violence in the Exploitation and Mass Incarceration of the Ethnic Poor in the United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donna Mulhearn</td>
<td>Urbicide: The Carthaginisation of Fallujah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zahra Shafigh</td>
<td>Tahrir Square 2011: How space helped a community to emerge in solidarity against tyranny</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Graduations**

Congratulations to the following 53 students who graduated with degrees in Peace and Conflict Studies in 2011, a further increase on last year's record of 49 coursework graduates. Some of these students completed their studies in 2010 and some in 2011.

**Master of Letters (Peace and Conflict Studies):**
Yoganaadan Kadirkamu Kandasamy
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Master of Peace and Conflict Studies:
Emmanuel Alano, Sybylla Anderson, Elmer Boongaling, Vicente Borgonia, Sarah Brake,
Chris Brown, Timothy Bryar, Emma Cockroft, Katie Crawford, Emma Dawson, Gal Farchi,
Holly Fingland, Allan Foster, Alex Gasko, Lisa Ghigliazza, Miriam Hagen, Brenda Hall,
James Henderson, Sean Hobbs, Erik Hof, Sky Hugman, Kimberly Kaschak, Vivian Kenny-Levick,
Yulia Khan, Anna Koehler, Nichola Krey, Annaliza Laylo, Henry Lebovic, Susy Lee Deck,
Andres Mafla, Alexandra Miller, Paule Neron, Jude Ogbonnaya, Benjamin Oh, Sahar Okhovat,
Perpetua Onchieku, Hubert Orzechowski, Gobie Rajalingam, Barbara Ratusznik, Mark Reddie,
Helen Reynolds, Michael Rose, Mary Saliba, Paul Scarfe, Susan Sotirias, Thomas Strang, Yang Zhang.

Graduate Diploma in Peace and Conflict Studies:
Jorge Mendoza Berrio, Nikram Rohani, Craig Sinclair

Graduate Certificate in Peace and Conflict Studies:
Shelley Booth, Adam Shaw

Student Prizes

Congratulations to Henry Lebovic who was awarded the Gordon Rodley Prize in Peace and Conflict Studies in 2011 for achieving an impressive High Distinction in his Masters degree. Donna Mulhearn received the Cheryl Minks Prize for the best MPACS dissertation in 2011. Donna’s dissertation entitled ‘Urbicide: The Carthaginisation of Fallujah’ discusses the important lessons to be learned from how urbicide - ‘the killing of a city’- was perpetrated in ancient Carthage and, she argues, more recently in the military campaign against Fallujah.

Student and Alumni Achievements

A steady trickle of CPACS students are either in, or go on to enjoy, successful careers in various branches of media. Dilnaz Boga, who graduated in 2004, currently works as a reporter for the Mumbai Mirror. With co-director and fellow journalist, Aliefa Vahanvaty, Dilnaz made the documentary film Invisible Kashmir: The Other Side of Jannat which highlights the impact of the conflict on the lives of ordinary people, especially children. Together with her long record of investigative reporting, the film helped to win her the prestigious Kate Webb Prize from Agence France-Presse in 2011. Mary Saliba, who received her MPACS in 2010, secured first a much sought-after internship, then a production job, with Al Jazeera English, in Doha. And Mark Reddie, who worked for Sky News here in Sydney during his time as a part time student at CPACS, now plies his trade as a producer at BBC Television News in London.
MPACS graduates are also making inroads into Canberra and contributing to peace and security in the Asia/Pacific region. Lachlan McGovern, who graduated in 2010, obtained a position with the Department of Defence where he is working on Solomon Islands and Papua New Guinea Defence and Whole of Government Policy. Lachlan completed a Masters dissertation on the Regional Assistance Mission in Solomon Islands (RAMSI) whilst at CPACS. MLitt (PACS) graduate Mihai Sorai, who joined the Department of Foreign Affairs graduate program in 2010, has been working on rotations in Afghanistan, Counter-Terrorism and Free Trade. Further afield, Sean Hobbs, who graduated in 2011, obtained a position based in Fiji working with the Pacific Regional Rights Resources Team, a division of the Secretariat of the Pacific Community. Two other MPACS graduates, Rebecca Chhan and Anne-Line Giudicelli, have been selected for the graduate program in the Department of Prime Minister and Cabinet starting in February 2012.

MPACS graduate Andrea Ottina from Italy completed a Master of Arts by Research at CPACS and graduated with Distinction in absentia in 2011. Whilst his thesis was under examination, Andrea completed a six months internship at the United Nations University (UNU) headquarters in Tokyo, Japan. There, Andrea supported a research project on the impact of HIV/AIDS on the armed forces of Sub-Saharan African countries and co-authored the introduction and one chapter in the book *HIV/AIDS and the Security Sector in Africa* published by UNU Press. Upon completion of his internship, Andrea travelled to Liberia, where he supported the work of a local NGO over a period of two months. In Monrovia, Andrea conducted capacity building workshops targeting university students, professionals and former combatants on themes such as conflict analysis, peacebuilding, and community development. In February 2012, Andrea will start a new position in Lusaka, Zambia, for LFS Financial Systems GmbH, a German consulting firm specialising in micro- and SME finance for developing countries.
The CPACS Research Community in 2011 comprised of 21 students including 14 PhDs; 5 Doctorate of Social Sciences; and 2 Master of Arts. A further 4 students are co-supervised with other departments. Research seminars were held throughout the year and in semester two included a highly engaging series of guest lectures by Emeritus Professor Stuart Rees entitled “Rees on Research: Learning about research methods through the conduct of your own research”. Special thanks to Prof. Rees for making time to support CPACS research students whilst also the busy Director of the Sydney Peace Foundation.

Congratulations to Dr David Penklis on his graduation in December 2011—CPACS’ first PhD to be awarded— for a thesis entitled “Implications of the 1993 to 2008 Burundi Peace Process for United Nations Peacekeeping Operations”. David is now working for the United Nations as director of the newly established regional peacekeeping support base in Entebbe, Uganda.

Also, congratulations to Camellia Webb-Gannon who submitted her doctoral thesis entitled “Birds of a Feather: Conflict and Unity within West Papua’s Independence Movement”, and will be awarded her PhD at the first graduation ceremony in 2012.

CPACS welcomed one new research student in 2011: Tim Bryar, who received an Australian Postgraduate Award to undertake his research project “Networking for Peace in the Pacific”. Both Tim Bryar and Juliet Bennett were successful in upgrading their MPhils to PhDs in 2011.

Special acknowledgement also goes to Punam Yadav for her successful application in attaining a highly competitive and prestigious Faculty Postgraduate Teaching Fellowship Award for 2012—another first for CPACS.

In 2011, CPACS research students continued to be extremely active in conducting fieldwork, presenting papers at local and international conferences and publishing their research, as well as engaging in teaching and advocacy including:
Juliet Bennett presented an international conference paper entitled “Panentheism and Peace: a Creative and Adventurous Story of Life, What is Life?” at the Theology, Science and Philosophy Conference, Centre for Philosophy and Theology, University of Nottingham. She also published “An Ethical Dilemma: Religious Fundamentalism and Peace Education”. *Ethical Perspectives*, Vol. 18, No. 2, pp. 197-228. Juliet was a teaching assistant for *Political Economy of Conflict and Peace* in first semester in CPACS, and in second semester was an invited visiting scholar at Lenoir-Rhyne University in North Carolina, developing and teaching a curriculum for *Storytelling* (Humanities) and co-teaching *War and Peace*.

Neven Bondokji who will be completing her doctorate in 2012 published an article entitled, “The Revolution of Frustrated Wills.” *PeaceWrites*, Issue 1, 2011 and undertook cross-institutional tutoring in "Islam, Media and Conflict" in semester 2 in the School of Humanities and Languages, University of Western Sydney. She also gave two postgraduate guest lectures at CPACS on *Social Identity Theory and The role of religion in the Palestinian-Israeli conflict: the case of Hamas*.

Tim Bryar has been engaged as an invited scholar at the University of South Pacific (Fiji) for 12 months; conference presenter at the Pacific Islands Political Science Association Conference in Apia, Samoa; co-author of “TRANSCEND Pacific/Oceania: A Philosophy and Network for Peace by Peaceful Means”, *Journal of Pacific Studies* Vol. 31, No 2, pp. 1-12; and co-convenor of research and advocacy network TRANSCEND Pacific Oceania.

Maria Frenchie Carreon was part of a plenary peace journalism panel at the International Association of Media Communications and Research (IAMCR) 2011 International Conference, at Kadir Has Universitesi in Istanbul, Turkey; and actively participated at three regional media conferences organized by the Mindanao Media Forum, MindaNews, and the Voice of Mindanao for Mindanao photojournalists, reporters, editors, and publishers. The conferences were on “Peace Journalism and Environment and Disaster Reporting in Southern Philippines” in Dipolog (October
2011), Cagayan de Oro (November 2011), and General Santos (December 2011). At these conferences, she presented four papers: “Reporting the US Military Presence in Southern Philippines through Peace Journalism”; “Peace Journalism, the Environment, and Disaster Reporting”; “Peace Journalism and Environment Reporting”; and “The Mindanao Journalist in an Environment Watch”.

**Lyn Dickens** was an academic visitor at the University of Cambridge where she conducted research for her thesis at the Faculty of English and Emmanuel College. During her year there, she participated in the ‘Postcolonial and Related Literatures’ Graduate Seminar series at the Faculty of English and the ‘Postcolonial Empires’ seminar series at the Centre for Research in Arts, Social Sciences and Humanities (CRASSH), at which she also presented. Over the year, Lyn further developed her thesis, which is tentatively titled ‘Transcultural Horizons: Race and the Limitations of Multiculturalism in ‘Mixed Race’ Australian Literature’.

**James Tonny Dhizaala** was teaching assistant for Transitional Justice unit and Peace building and tutor in ‘race and racism’ (with the Koori Centre); chaired the panel “Transitional Justice in Africa: Challenges, Contributions and Paradoxes in Human Rights Accountability and Peacebuilding” and presented a paper entitled: “The Politics of Transitional Justice: Paradoxes and Challenges of the Liberian Truth and Reconciliation Commission” at the 54th Annual Meeting Events of the African Studies Association (ASA) “50 Years of African Liberation” Conference held in Washington, DC; and also participated in the pre ASA Conference workshop “Governance and Development: Reassessing and Reinventing Power Sharing and Decentralization in Africa” organised by USAID in partnership with the School for International Service at American University.


Research

Associate Professor Jake Lynch, Dr Wendy Lambourne and Dr Lynda-ann Blanchard

Peace Journalism Research

Associate Professor Jake Lynch, Director

Highlights from 2011:

- Successful panels at IAMCR
- Publication of edited collection by IPRA Peace Journalism Commission
- Routledge commission for book of ARC project, A Global Standard for Reporting Conflict
- Adoption of Peace Journalism as policy of World Association for Christian Communication

It's 15 years since Annabel McGoldrick and I ran the first Peace Journalism Summer School in the UK. The principal speaker was Johan Galtung, and he produced a one-page briefing on the tasks for the peace journalist, complete with the now famous table contrasting it with the mainstream ‘war journalism’.

The event took place at Taplow Court, an agreeable stately home in the south of England and the UK cultural centre of the SGI Buddhist group. In its grounds is a weeping fig tree, planted by Winston Churchill as a symbol of his gloom at the state of the world on the brink of war.

Since then, peace journalists have brought renewed hope and optimism, and a challenge and inspiration to use their work for good, to editors and reporters in many countries, through advocacy and training by ourselves and countless others. Intertwined with these endeavours have been developing strands of scholarly research, as Peace Journalism has grown rapidly as a field in its own right in the international academic community.

The year just gone added further episodes to this story. There were two Peace Journalism panels, and an interesting ‘research scoping’ discussion, at the International Association of Media and Communication Researchers, in Istanbul in July. Among the presenters were two CPACS research students, Frencie Carreon and Leticia Anderson.
My own presentation was on my project sponsored by the Australian Research Council (with partnership by Act for Peace and the International Federation of Journalists), which draws heavily on Peace Journalism to enable comparisons between media from different milieux of time, place and discursive context. My abstract, in the conference program, caught the eye of an influential publisher, Routledge.

So my own research activity in the second half of 2011 was dominated by exchanges of a book proposal, sample chapters, reviewer reports and responses, culminating in a decision by Routledge to offer me a contract to publish the book – also to be called *A Global Standard for Reporting Conflict* – which will appear some time in 2013.

The year’s end also saw publication of an edited collection, *Expanding Peace Journalism: Comparative and Critical Approaches*, which I jointly edited with two colleagues, Ibrahim Seaga Shaw and Robert A. Hackett. The book, published by Sydney University Press, draws together contributions based on papers presented to the Peace Journalism Commission of IPRA, the International Peace Research Association, at its conference in 2010, which we hosted at the University of Sydney. As well as my own, there is a chapter by CPACS part-time lecturer, Annabel McGoldrick.

In a felicitous piece of circularity, the Preface is by none other than Johan Galtung himself (also, as readers will recall the keynote speaker at IPRA). We have been interpreting, developing and expanding on his initial one-page briefing for all these years – with the new research now pushing the boundaries of the original concept to explore prospects for linkages between Peace Journalism and adjacent fields of media democratization initiatives, and alternative media. From the book’s thematic Introduction:

‘Most Peace Journalism (PJ) activity has focused on the representation of conflict in corporate media, often called mainstream media – a category encompassing public broadcasting as well as journalism commercially produced and sold. A growing number of PJ researchers advocate, instead, a root-and-branch critique of mainstream journalism as a privileged professional practice, indissociable from the predominant ‘war journalism’ style of reporting that PJ sets out, in scholarly research, to problematise; with adjacent exhortatory and pedagogical initiatives typically promoting feasible and preferable alternatives. Instead of examining or championing the case for marginal reforms in corporate media, these scholars argue that PJ should concentrate on ‘the tradition of radical journalism [openly] committed to progressive social change’; a tradition now enlivened and greatly expanded by new media technologies.

[On the other hand], journalism can be distinguished, as a form of public communication, precisely by its declared commitment to ‘internal goals’, in contrast to such endeavours as, say, political advertising, which are avowedly instrumentalist. This... accounts for the ‘trust bonus’ that journalism still enjoys, and [it is argued], PJ advocates would squander it at their peril’. 
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Expanding Peace Journalism is the fifth edited volume dedicated to the subject, following the four earlier ones:


Between them, the five volumes include 63 chapters by 66 authors – an extensive record for a span of five years or so (since the first appeared) – to set alongside the Peace Journalism monographs, journal articles and conference presentations.

Throughout its development, the infrastructure for peace journalism has been fragmentary and sporadic: a sympathetic project officer from a funding body here; an interested group of journalists (perhaps facing problems reporting a particular conflict) there. Up to now the most extensive backing has come from the Philippines, with support from Mindanews, which convenes the Mindanao Media Summits, and the Pecojon network of trainers, editors and reporters.

Jake Lynch and Annabel McGoldrick filming in Mindanao as part of their ARC research on a Global Standard for Reporting Conflict, February 2011
2011 saw an additional step towards formulating a more systematic approach, through the World Association for Christian Communication, which acts as an umbrella body for affiliated NGOs worldwide with broadly-defined interests in media, peace and democratisation.

I ran a ‘learning stream’ in Peace Journalism for WACC members at their global Congress in Cape Town in 2008. Since then, the Association has adopted Peace Journalism as a key policy; brought out a useful ‘No-nonsense guide’ to the subject and used its quarterly magazine, *Media Development*, to explore the issues from its members’ perspectives. Its mid-year edition was titled, ‘Peace Journalism: Giving Power to the People’, and featured contributions from Nepal, Kenya, Fiji and Lebanon along with thematic articles focusing on gender issues in Peace Journalism and the prospects for coordinating training across national borders.

Peace Journalism has exerted a gradually growing influence, both within and beyond the academy, over the last 15 years, and it continues to reach more people and stir more interest in many contexts.
Transitional Justice, Reconciliation and Peacebuilding
Dr Wendy Lambourne

_Transformative Justice: An Idea Whose Time Has Come?_

The concept of transformative justice which I defined and elaborated in my 2009 article in the *International Journal of Transitional Justice* became the central focus of a new Transformative Justice World Universities Network led by the Centre for Global Development at the University of Leeds and the Centre for Applied Human Rights at the University of York. My 2009 article was quoted extensively in the concept note on transformative justice produced by the new WUN network. University of Sydney's Deputy Vice-Chancellor (International) and School of Social and Political Sciences provided funding to enable my participation in an international conference organised by the network on 12-13 May 2011 at the University of Leeds. I presented a paper on ‘Transformative Justice and Peacebuilding: A Psychosocial Perspective’ and contributed to discussions about the future of the network at a meeting following the conference.

One of the outcomes of the meeting was a conference panel proposal on transformative justice submitted for the International Studies Association Annual Convention to be held in San Diego, California in April 2012. Another outcome was a successful bid submitted to the WUN Research Development Fund 2011 to hold an international conference on ‘Transforming Post-Conflict Societies: Everyday Violence and Access to Justice’ in London on 22 May 2012. The grant includes funding for my participation in the conference in London. Unfortunately, my application to the University of Sydney's International Program Development Fund on behalf of a group of scholars from various departments and faculties was unsuccessful in attracting funds for a regional workshop on transformative justice to be held in Sydney.

**Research Grants and Projects**

My application for Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences Research Support Scheme funding was successful and I received $8000 for the project ‘Transformative Justice, Reconciliation and Peacebuilding in Timor Leste’. I also continued work on my School-funded project with the Cambodian diaspora community in Sydney in relation to the ongoing Khmer Rouge trials in Cambodia, and I commenced a new research project focused on analysing memorialisation of the genocide within the Rwandan diaspora community in Sydney.

**Presentations and Publications**

In January I undertook my first visit to Japan in order to deliver an invited keynote presentation at the international symposium ‘Towards New Peace Studies: Reconciliatory Governance and Sustainable Peacebuilding in Conflict and Post-Conflict Areas’ at Ritsumeikan University in Kyoto. I presented several models of reconciliation from John Paul Lederach, Vern Neufeld Redekop and Brandon Hamber and argued that ‘reconciliation is about creating transformative relational spaces that enable healing of
the gap between self and other'. I concluded by proposing a concept of reconciliatory governance that would promote conflict transformation by creating a 'framework for peaceful community relations by providing spaces for participation, communication, social dialogue, peaceful disagreement and ongoing reconciliation'. I was also invited to give a Peace and Conflict Studies seminar for students and staff at Ritsumeikan University's Graduate School of International Relations on 'Transformative Justice, Reconciliation and Peacebuilding After Mass Violence'. This seminar provided an opportunity to discuss in more depth some of the ideas from my presentation at the symposium.

I was one of the invited speakers for an international workshop on transitional justice organised by the Department of Sociology and Social Policy at University of Sydney on 25 February 2011. The workshop explored transitional justice from the perspective of victims, with a particular focus on tensions between law and morality in the process of reconciliation and the way human rights and trauma have become universalising discourses for victim recognition. In my presentation entitled 'Justice for Whom: Victim Participation in Transitional Justice', I assessed the extent to which victims have been included as participants in transitional justice processes such as criminal tribunals and truth commissions. Based on field research conducted in Cambodia in 2009 and Northern Uganda in 2010, I reflected on victim participation and outreach programs of the Extraordinary Chambers of the Courts of Cambodia and the International Criminal Court. I proposed the inclusion of 'inreach' as an integral component of outreach in order to meet the justice needs and expectations of victims as well as others in the affected community.

I was invited to present on East Timor at a workshop on 'Transitional Justice in the Asia-Pacific' at Griffith University, Queensland, in June 2011. This workshop brought together leading transitional justice scholars from the UK, US and Australia to discuss the practices, processes and problems associated with transitional justice in the region. Participants included Kathryn Sikkink (University of Minnesota), Leigh Payne (University of Oxford), Chandra Sriram (SOAS, University of London), Kirsten Ainley (London School of Economics), Edward Aspinall and Fajran Zain (Australian National University), and the hosts, Hunjoon Kim and Renée Jeffery (Griffith University). In my presentation entitled 'Locating Transitional Justice in Timor Leste: Politics, Participation, and Peacebuilding', I analysed the political dynamics of power and influence created by the globalisation of transitional justice, and the tensions between international legal norms, national interests and local aspirations for justice and reconciliation played out in Timor Leste. As part of this analysis, I applied the concept of
transformative justice to understanding the multiple justice priorities of affected populations in such a transitional context, taking into account the need to not only deal with the past but also to build a secure, just and peaceful future.

An international conference on Indigenous Rights and Transitional Justice was held at Australian National University on 20 October 2011. I was an invited speaker on the first panel which set the theme focused on indigenous rights, transitional justice and healing. In my presentation, I argued that a model of transformative justice could provide a framework for understanding how transitional justice can contribute to indigenous rights by addressing structural violence in addition to direct violence, and focusing on socioeconomic and political justice as well as legal justice for past human rights violations. Other sessions considered Australian and international perspectives on reconciliation, rights, trauma and healing, with reference to cases including Australian and American indigenous peoples, South Africa, Spain, Timor Leste, Solomon Islands, Chile, Bolivia and Peru.

In November-December, I travelled to the US, Northern Uganda and Europe. I presented a paper on ‘The Locus of Transitional Justice in Africa: The International Criminal Court and Civil Society Participation’ at the African Studies Association Annual Conference in Washington, DC on 17-20 November 2011. In Kitgum in Northern Uganda, I was an invited presenter on ‘Diaspora Memories and Transitional Justice’ at the second African Institute for Transitional Justice short course from 21-27 November 2011 organised by the Refugee Law Project, Makerere University, Uganda in collaboration with the African Transitional Justice Network. The training focused on the role of memorialisation in transitional justice and involved participants from many African countries including Burundi, Democratic Republic of Congo, Kenya, Uganda, Morocco, Namibia, South Africa, Zimbabwe and Sudan. On 2 December 2011, I presented a paper and led a roundtable discussion on ‘Resurrecting Reconciliation in the Discourse and Practice of Transitional Justice’ at Swisspeace in Bern, Switzerland. This is the title of an article which is under consideration for publication in the International Journal of Transitional Justice in 2012.
I was an invited presenter for the Third International Seminar ‘Transitional Justice: an interdisciplinary perspective’ that took place from 5-6 December 2011 at the Flemish Academic Centre for Science and the Arts in Brussels. At the seminar, key speakers discussed the contribution of their particular discipline to the field of transitional justice. My presentation on transitional justice and peacebuilding explored how peace and conflict studies theories contribute to understanding the goals and means of pursuing transitional justice after mass violence. Other presentations covered the contributions of sociology, criminology, social psychology, history, law and political sciences.


Media Interviews and Public Appearances
During 2011, I was approached a number of times for radio and television interviews. On 5 April, I was interviewed for ABC News 24 TV channel on the topic of the United Nations intervention in Cote d’Ivoire, and on 22 August, I was interviewed by SBS Radio for the Khmer Language program about the Extraordinary Chambers in the Courts of Cambodia and justice. The visit of the United Nations Secretary-General, Ban Ki-moon, to the University of Sydney on 8 September was the occasion for an interview broadcast live by ABC Radio morning news. I spoke about the significance of the Secretary-General’s visit for Australians, and his emphasis on the need for more concerted global action to combat the impact of climate change.

On 13 September, I chaired a Sydney Ideas seminar and book launch for Leah Chishugi, a survivor of the Rwandan genocide, at the Sydney Law School. Leah spoke about her experiences of trauma following the genocide, after which she was joined for a panel discussion by Dr Jennifer Dawson who runs TraumAid International based in Sydney. Leah made a plea to the capacity audience for support for her charity, Everything is a Benefit, which helps other women who continue to suffer rape and other violence in eastern Congo where she grew up. Leah’s book, A Long Way from Paradise: Surviving the Rwandan Genocide, was published by Virago Press in London in 2010. Further details about the book can be found in my review published in PeaceWrites, No. 2011/02, October 2011.
International Peace Projects, Consortia and Awards
Dr Lynda-ann Blanchard

2011 was an inspiring year in terms of participating in national and international research consortia (see specific details below) and reinvigorating primary research interests during my Special Studies Program (SSP), supported by HOS Prof. Simon Tormey and Faculty Dean Prof. Duncan Ivison. During my semester’s absence from CPACS, I visited the Canadian Gwich’in Social & Cultural Institute (GSCI) in Yellowknife & Tsiigehtchic for one month and the Centre for Human Rights Education (CHRE) at Curtin University (Perth) for two months. Furthermore, a 12 months academic secondment to Curtin University will be undertaken from February 2011 - February 2012.

Dialogues of Difference

The SSP research project “Dialogues of Difference: Citizenship Negotiated According to Identity in the Contest between Literate and Oral Traditions” stems from my doctoral research. In order to research the intersections between cultural difference and social justice it is invaluable to collaborate with such research centres as GSCI. This collaboration has been ongoing for over ten years— although my last visit in 1999 was undertaken in the height of summer when the sun doesn’t set in the arctic circle and the temperature hovers around 30C; this visit was undertaken in the middle of winter when the sun never rises, and the temperatures are around -30C! In Tsiigehtchic, a remote Canadian First Nations community with a resident population of 120 people, GSCI undertakes oral knowledge and heritage research for the entire Gwich’in Settlement Region. In Yellowknife, capital city of Canada’s Northwest Territories, GSCI’s research director coordinates projects, reports and publications. During my month-long stay, my role was to take part in a ten year review of the implementation plan relating to the Gwich’in Land Claim Agreement with the Canadian government. (2012, marks the 20th anniversary of the Gwich’in Nation’s land settlement agreement with the Canadian Government.)

This research combines an innovative methodology of field research – using cultural and oral narratives – with an analysis of the theory and practice of citizenship and its impact
on human rights. A particularly significant contribution will be the focus on collaborative research with the Gwich’in community, and the assessment of local interpretations of human rights policy and practice as it pertains to oral traditions. This research and subsequent book will offer theoretical insights into the relationship between oral and literate traditions, in negotiating citizenship rights.

**Envisioning Peace Tourism**

Together with a colleague from the University of South Australia, Dr Freya Higgins-Desbiolles, we proposed the project, *Envisioning Peace through Tourism: a research project to promote human security through international citizenship* in response to The Toda Institute for Global Peace and Policy Research initiated *Humanitarian Competition for Global Visioning* in 2009. The idea of “Humanitarian Competition,” was first proposed by Tsunesaburo Makiguchi in his 1903 work *The Geography of Human Life*. It sprang from Makiguchi’s observation that competition based on military, political or economic superiority was not serving the best interests of humankind. Instead, he envisioned a world in which groups and nations would vie with each other to find the most effective and humane solutions to our most urgent problems. In keeping with Makiguchi’s observation that competition based on economic superiority was not serving the best interests of humankind, this research project develops an understanding of how tourism can be harnessed to achieve important humanitarian goals, including peace, justice and respect for human rights. This project along with two others was successful. The Toda Institute award included support to (i) bring ten peace tourism academics and practitioners together for a two day working conference in Sydney July 2010 and (ii) provide a book to publish the ensuing research findings, working title *Envisioning Peace Tourism* (forthcoming 2012).

That manuscript is now in its final stages of production, and presents an alternative characterisation of the possibilities for peace through tourism: envisioning tourism in the context of human rights and social justice. Such an approach engages the ambivalence and dichotomy of views held on peace tourism by relying on a pedagogy of peace. Contributions come from scholars from many disciplinary backgrounds, non-governmental organizations (NGOs), tourism industry operators and community, all united by an interest in critical approaches to understanding peace through tourism. Importantly, diverse geo-political contexts are represented in this book from the USA, India, Japan, Israel, Palestine, Kenya, the Koreas, Indonesia and Indigenous Australia. Additionally, a key strength of this volume is the inclusion of contributions seldom found in the tourism academic literature, including: NGOs such as Equations (India), Peace Boat (Japan) and Tourism Concern (UK); tourism industry operators including the Alternative Tourism Group (Palestine) and Touchdown Tours (Australian operator specializing in Middle Eastern destinations); and community including Ngarrindjeri Being Heard (Indigenous Australia).
In 2011 an MOU was signed between the University and the Universidade Nacional Timor Lorosa’e (UNTL). That understanding encourages “visits from one Institution to the other by members of their academic staff for the purpose of participating in teaching, training, research programs and other agreed activities” and “the exchange of publications and other information between the institutions”. Given my ongoing involvement in research projects such as Peace Tourism in Timor Leste—an action-research endeavour that aims to engage youth in nation-building policy development and delivery—and active conference participation over the past several years in conferences held in Deli, East Timor such as “Our Lives, Our Work: Women in Post-Conflict Timor Leste” (2011) and “Women as Creative Agents for Peace-Building” (2009), I was invited to attend initial discussions regarding the newly established MOU, held at the University on July 6th 2011. Subsequent meetings with Prof. Aurelio Guterres, Rector (UNTL) and colleagues from the fledging Peace and Conflict Studies Centre were undertaken in Dili on Sept 5th, 2011 to discuss ways in which CPACS could support the development of research, teaching and training activities at UNTL.
Special Projects

Refugee Language Program
Lesley Carnus, Coordinator

The Refugee Language Program has continued to provide classes and individual tutoring to a diverse group of refugees and asylum seekers in its capacity as provider of skilled teachers of English as a second language. We currently run five classes including an academic writing class on Wednesday evenings, an intermediate English class, a creative writing class and a computer class on Saturdays. Students come from many different countries including, Iran, Iraq, Sri Lanka, Nigeria, Burundi, Indonesia and Afghanistan and all are most appreciative of the quality teaching and care they receive from our staff.

Currently there are 6 class teachers working in the Refugee Language Program, 12 computer tutors and over 20 other volunteers and home tutors who are actively involved in varying capacities. In 2011 there has been an increase in applications from volunteers wanting to work with refugees.

In the second half of the year, we have had an increase in enrolments due to the Federal Government’s decision to move asylum seekers out of detention into the community. This group consists mainly of family groups as well as unaccompanied minors. As community detention detainees have no right to TAFE or Adult ESL classes, most are very keen to enrol in classes here at Sydney University and usually make lengthy trips to attend.

We have provided individual support to a number of refugees this year. These include a Social Work undergraduate from Sierra Leone who was failing her study; a young man with no formal education from the Sudan who was failing at school; as well as a doctor from Afghanistan and a dentist from Egypt who needed extra coaching to pass their Occupational English Test.

In December, the co-ordinator held an information and training session for new mentors who have volunteered to help students with their English language study over the summer break. The session included procedures for getting started, basic teaching ideas and material for tutorials.

The Refugee Language Program is a very dynamic program that is constantly changing to reflect the needs of the people we work with. The commitment of our volunteers is strong and most volunteers make individual contributions far beyond their teaching or mentoring roles.

In 2011 the Vice-Chancellor indicated that the Refugee Language Program would no longer report directly to him, but would instead report to the Dean of Arts. At this stage we are unsure if any accompanying funding has been allocated. As in previous years, the
staff of the Refugee Language Program have taken a summer break, not knowing if we will return in 2012 to continue the valuable contribution we make to the lives and education of refugees and asylum seekers.

On 31 January 2012, the Coordinator received an email from the Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences informing her that due to budgetary constraints, the University would no longer fund the Refugee Language Program.
Australian Council for Human Rights Education (ACHRE)
Dr Lynda-ann Blanchard, Vice-President

The Australian Council for Human Rights Education (ACHRE) actively promoted human rights issues throughout 2011 via publications, conferences and networking. A snapshot of that diary includes:


Dec. 19th: The United Nations General Assembly in New York adopted the Declaration on Human Rights Education and Training. This landmark document recognises the right of every one of the planet’s seven billion people to have access to human rights education, a lifelong process involving all ages, all parts of society, and every kind of education, formal and informal. The Declaration specifies not simply what one should learn about human rights, but also how (“through human rights, which includes learning and teaching in a way that respects the rights of both educators and learners”) and also why (“for human rights, which includes empowering persons to enjoy and exercise their rights and to respect and uphold the rights of others”). The adoption of this new Declaration also offers educators and policy makers an occasion to reassess national policies and priorities in the light of international standards. If as the Declaration states, “human rights education and training is essential for the promotion of universal respect for and observance of all human rights and fundamental freedoms for all,” then human rights education is not only the entitlement of every human being, but also a necessity for responsible global citizenship.


Dec. 10th: NTCHRE celebrated the Human Rights Day at Charles Darwin University. It was a celebration of dynamic energy, life and liberty. Over 300 people including children from detention and many resettled refugee communities attended. The event was covered by ABCTV and reported in the NT Times. NTCHRE received a salutary note from DIAC commending the event and stating it was an event which will open more public participation to children in detention. NTCHRE President Jeswynn Yogaratnam provided a video link that captured some of the events during the day, available at http://learnline.cdu.edu.au/units/lwz108/media/human-rights-day-2011/hrd2011.html.

Federal Parliament has enacted new laws requiring all proposed Federal legislation to be assessed for its compatibility with Australia’s human rights obligations. The Human Rights (Parliamentary Scrutiny) Act 2011, which commences on 4 January 2012, introduces two primary measures designed to better protect and promote human rights in Australia.
Nov. 19th: NCHRE AGM held in Adelaide. The NCHRE changed its name to *Australian Council for Human Rights Education*.

Nov. 14-16th: NCHRE assisted with the *Second International Conference on Human Rights Education*, Durban, South Africa. Dr S Ozdowski and Dr N Burridge of NCHRE delivered papers in Durban and discussed cooperation with the KwaZulu Natal University. For more information visit: [www.hre2011.ukzn.ac.za](http://www.hre2011.ukzn.ac.za)

Oct. 18-22th: NCHRE co-sponsored “*the Women’s Forum for Peace and Development “Promoting Gender Equality, Prevention of GBV and Advancing Integration of Peace and Human Rights Education in School Curricula*” in Kampala, Uganda. NCHRE also administered the ISSS AusAID grant and its President Dr Ozdowski delivered a paper titled “Women’s Rights: Some comparisons between Australia & Uganda”.


Sept. 19th: NTCHRE has been awarded $64,000 Federal Attorney General Human Rights Education Grant to develop pedagogy in human rights education for indigenous children in remote communities and to conduct one day seminars in 12 remote community schools. Further information is available on: [www.ag.gov.au/hrgrants](http://www.ag.gov.au/hrgrants)

West Papua Project

Jim Elmslie, Co-Coordinator

The West Papua Project had a stellar year in 2011. Under the leadership of coordinator Cammi Webb-Gannon, and co-conveners Peter King and Jim Elmslie, a conference on the theme Comprehending West Papua (CWP) was held at CPACS on February 21st and 22nd. This conference drew on the strong positive feedback generated by our report Get up, stand up: West Papua stands up for its rights, published in July, 2010.

The CWP conference drew participants from Australia, Japan, Holland, England, the US, Japan, Singapore, Indonesia, New Zealand and Vanuatu, including many West Papuans, some noted foreign-based independence supporters among them. This may have been the most important academic level conference ever held on the contemporary political situation in West Papua – the Pacific region’s most vexatious and long running conflict. Speakers included a high proportion of the world’s top experts on West Papua and of the most important and respected West Papua leaders and intellectuals. The social networking generated by the conference strengthened global cohesiveness of Papuan scholars and peace activists.

Papers were presented on a wide range of topics that collectively sought to deepen our understanding of the conflict and where it might be heading. Participants presented (some via Skype and some in absentia) papers which were edited and collated into a book named after the conference, published electronically under the CPACS banner in late 2011. Comprehending West Papua can be viewed online at the WPP website and will also be available in hard copy. This book represents a major advance in our knowledge on this conflict.

Different factions of the West Papuan independence movement, as well as pro-Indonesian voices, were heard and their views subsequently published in the CWP book. This in itself was a significant achievement as the movement towards a dialogue between Jakarta and the Papuans gathers momentum, and as the various factions and ethnic groups within West Papua formulate new strategies to deal with an Indonesian state that seems to have begun to realize its vulnerability regarding Papua. During the course of 2011 formal and informal conversations with Indonesian academic and semi-state bodies continued, showing the growing linkages between the WPP and its Indonesian and West Papua based counterparts, all bent on trying to find pathways that may ameliorate the conflict.

Following on from the conference, and based on secret Indonesian military documents leaked to the WPP, another report was published in August 2011: Anatomy of an Occupation: The Indonesian Military in West Papua. This report detailed the nature of Indonesian rule in West Papua, revealing that state control and surveillance pervaded the entire society, not just in the extensively documented armed resistance groups but
also all other civil society bodies including churches, local governments, youth and student groups, indeed in all aspects of Papuan life. Details of independence activists murdered by the Indonesian military underscored the seriousness of the conflict.

The West Papua Project continues to grow as an academic think tank and as a network of academics, journalists, political activists and politicians. It now has a global footprint, which is appropriate for an Australian Centre given our close proximity to West Papua and the importance that this issue has for Australia’s own geo-political future.

Sri Lanka Human Rights Project

Gobie Rajalingam and Brami Jegan, Co-conveners

In 2011 the Sri Lanka Human Rights Project (SLHRP) continued to raise awareness on Sri Lanka's post conflict situation, highlighting the need for justice and dialogue as a precursor to a lasting peace amongst conflict affected populations.

Through forums, media releases and events, SLHRP continued to call for the Australian Government to add its voice to a growing number of governments and human rights groups that support an international independent investigation into the alleged war crimes committed in the final stages of the war.

Three events highlight SLHRP’s achievements in 2011:

- ‘The Sound of Silence’ photography exhibition
- ‘Time for action on Sri Lanka war crimes: Where journalism led, will governments follow? A forum conducted in conjunction with the Australian Centre for Independent Journalism’
- Community roundtable in Federal Parliament

The Sound of Silence, June 2011

Hosted by Mori Gallery in Sydney and supported by a broad alliance of community groups, ‘The Sound of Silence’ showcased multi-media artworks by Australian photographer Shelley Morris who travelled to Sri Lanka in 2010 in the aftermath of the country's civil war. Presenting an interactive exhibition that consisted of music, photographs, interviews and audience-participation artworks, Shelley Morris highlighted the struggle faced by affected populations in Sri Lanka's north. As a guest speaker, Gordon Weiss (author, documentary maker, and former UN spokesperson for Sri Lanka) congratulated Shelley for her thought provoking and awareness-raising exhibition that encourages the international community to advocate for dialogue and justice in post-conflict Sri Lanka.
Time for action on Sri Lanka war crimes: Where journalism led, will governments follow?’
October 2011

In October 2011 the Centre for Peace and Conflict Studies at the University of Sydney and the Australian Centre for Independent Journalism hosted the forum *Time for action on Sri Lanka war crimes: Where journalism led, will governments follow?* The panel consisted of Greens Senator Lee Rhiannon, Professor Wendy Bacon, Associate Professor and Director of CPACS Jake Lynch and SLHRP co-convenor Brami Jegan. The forum discussed Australia’s role in post conflict Sri Lanka in comparison to the stances of the UK and US governments, and discussed the role journalists had and continue to play during and after the war.

Community roundtable in Federal Parliament, October 2011

SLHRP participated in a roundtable meeting hosted by the Australian Greens in Federal Parliament that was organized to acknowledging the attendance of Sri Lankan Prime Minister Mahinda Rajapakse at the Commonwealth Heads of Government Meeting in Perth in October. As an outcome of the discussion, a broad alliance of Australians from across the political spectrum called on the Australian Government and the Federal Opposition to: (1) Support calls for Sri Lanka to be suspended from the Councils of the Commonwealth until the government of Sri Lanka agreed to an international independent investigation into war crimes, restoration of human rights and the rule of law and (2) Oppose Sri Lanka hosting CHOGM in 2013 until there is progress on Sri Lanka’s human rights situation and the establishment of an independent investigation into war crimes.

SLHRP Grants

In 2010 the Sri Lanka Human Rights project was awarded two grants which were partially spent in 2011. The first was a Volunteer Grant from the Department of Families, Housing, Community Services and Indigenous Affairs, for $3800 which was put towards video recording equipment for SLHRP related projects.

The second was a Local Community Grant through the City of Sydney for $5000 towards a Refugee Education Program. SLHRP supported and worked in partnership with a community based refugee resettlement group Tamil Refugee Assistance Network (TRAN), which was established in 2011 by members of the Australian Tamil community, and is based in the Tamil refugee community in Pendle Hill. TRAN assists the growing number of Tamil refugees to adapt to the Australian way of life without compromising their cultural roots. SLHRP provided $3000 to support TRAN’s *Driving Knowledge Test Preparation Project* (July to December 2011), an initiative that assisted 13 refugees improve their driving skills. SLHRP also provided funds for TRAN for purchasing stationary, including a printer for their office. The remaining grant will be used on similar refugee assistance projects in 2012. Aside from SLHRP’s activities with TRAN, an allocation of the Local Community Grant was also used to assist with ‘fear + hope’, (June-July 2011), an exhibition of artworks by asylum seekers living within Australia’s detention centres.
Honouring Noam Chomsky

In what was perhaps the most widely acclaimed decision over the 13 years of the existence of the Sydney Peace Foundation, the jury awarded the 2011 Sydney Peace Prize to Professor Noam Chomsky. The citation read:

“For inspiring the convictions of millions about a common humanity and for unfailing moral courage. For critical analysis of democracy and power, for challenging secrecy, censorship and violence and for creating hope through scholarship and activism to promote the attainment of universal human rights.”

The values which Professor Chomsky has written about in numerous books and which he expressed in his various appearances in Sydney, Melbourne and Adelaide came in his message to Julian Assange in London: “I would like to thank you for fulfilling your responsibilities as a member of free societies whose citizens have every right to know what [the] government is doing.”

The Sydney Peace Foundation office was inundated with calls and messages as Professor Chomsky was in constant demand.

His crowded program over four hectic days included many media interviews, a reception held by the Governor of NSW at Government House, his 2011 City of Sydney Peace Prize Lecture in Sydney Town Hall, and a Q&A session with Mary Kostakidis in the Sydney Opera House. Both events were sold out.

On 3 November he was awarded the Sydney Peace Prize at a gala dinner in Sydney University’s McLaurin Hall. The award was made by Australia’s ‘father of reconciliation’ and 2008 recipient of the Sydney Peace Prize, Patrick Dodson. Patrick was introduced by the Lord Mayor of Sydney, Clover Moore MP.
Tributes to Professor Chomsky included the highly significant message from his friend the Indian novelist, human rights campaigner and recipient of the 2004 Sydney Peace Prize Arundhati Roy who wrote,

'It is wonderful that Noam Chomsky is being honoured this evening with the Sydney Peace Prize. But we must remember this is a man who is beyond prizes. He is somebody who has helped the world to deepen its understanding of what peace means and what war means, and to expose the subterfuge that lies under the easy deployment of those words. If I had been there right now, I would have given him a hug that would have embarrassed him in public. I love him.'

The following day Professor Chomsky was welcomed to ‘Voices Inspiring Peace’, Cabramatta High School’s unique peace festival. Over 1,200 students from twenty-one schools participated in this colourful, inspiring occasion.

Youth Peace Initiative
In mid 2011, the Sydney Peace Foundation recommenced the Youth Peace Initiative (YPI) — the Foundation’s project engaging young people in conversations about peace with justice.

In late 2011 the YPI facilitated its first video conference in over a year. This was hosted by Engadine High and welcomed the participation of six other high schools across NSW representing students from as far as Bega in rural NSW.

Addressing the issue of how to foster social activism in youth, students interacted energetically via the “connected classrooms” technology. From swapping advice on the “dos and don’ts” of fundraising (cake stalls are still effective in the 21st C!), to sharing personal stories of journeys to Australia. It was impressive to see these young people voluntarily give up their lunch break to talk with their peers about issues of peace with justice. Some felt comfortable to share their own stories of arriving in Australia as a
refugee; illustrating and personalising what can often remain an abstract subject matter. The positive effect of this was overwhelming.

For YPI, 2011 has been a time to take stock of the objectives and activities of the project, foster new partnerships with community and educational service providers, craft strategies for engaging high schools across NSW in 2012, and of course, to seek funding from philanthropic and government grants.

Our student-centred approach to pedagogy is unique and at the core of YPI’s engagement with youth. YPI projects are designed to foster genuine ownership and participation from students, to create a nurturing youth-adult partnership and to allow for flexible and adaptive learning environments.

In translating this philosophy into practice, YPI encourages critical thinking and evaluations of what we call “the politics of identity”, that is, the development of self-image and self-confidence.

Other activities
Sydney Peace Foundation staff wrote many articles and media releases and spoke at many conferences, public meetings, debates and street protests throughout the year on topics ranging from the continuing siege of Gaza, to war crimes in Sri Lanka and later the Australian Government’s reinforcing of its alliance with the USA by agreement to station 2,500 US marines in Darwin.

Rewarding Julian Assange
At the end of 2010, members of the SPF Council decided to award the Foundation’s gold medal to the co-founder of Wikileaks, Julian Assange. We did so on the conviction that Assange and his colleagues were challenging centuries of assumptions that governments needed secrecy in order to govern.

In response to Wikileaks revelations about the conduct of the US government, American politicians and media commentators argued that Assange should be captured or assassinated. The Australian Government responded by saying that Assange would not be welcome in this country and could have his passport confiscated.

We were appalled that American response to a championing of freedom of information was to advocate violence and that Australia’s official response reeked of cowardice.

In the light of such events, Professor Rees, Mary Kostakidis (former Chair of the Foundation) and Dr Hannah Middleton met at the Front Line Club in London where we presented Julian with the Foundation’s gold medal “for exceptional courage in pursuit of universal human rights”.

WikiLeaks and Freedom: Breaking Australia’s Silence
The Foundation staff became the catalyst for organising a public forum on the need to ‘break Australia’s silence’ – about the value of freedom of the press and freedom of information as shown by the Wikileaks revelations.
From January to March the SPF staff worked daily to ensure the success of the March forum in the Sydney Town Hall, addressed by John Pilger, Julian Burnside QC and the Independent Tasmanian MP, Andrew Wilkie.

In organising this significant public event, the support of our Partner in Peace the City of Sydney was crucial. Our commitment to this event also derived from our awareness of and respect for that ruling of the US Supreme Court in the case of Daniel Ellsberg of Pentagon papers fame: “Only a free and unrestrained press can effectively expose deception in government.”

On March 16, the Sydney public broke their silence. Thousands filled the Town Hall. Hundreds were on the streets unable to get in. The significance of the speakers’ main message – on the public’s right to know – was underscored by the indifference of mainstream media. They ignored the occasion.

Professor Stuart Rees, Director of the Sydney Peace Foundation, addresses guests at the 2011 Sydney Peace Prize Gala Dinner, held at Sydney University's MacLaurin Hall, 3 November 2011.
Library Report

Peggy Craddock, Librarian

The Resource Centre is now entering its fourteenth year, and continues to grow. This year's growth of the Resource Centre is marked by help and assistance from CPACS community. Large donations from Frank Hutchinson, Lynda-ann Blanchard, Garry Trompf, and Hannah Middleton have been processed and added to the collection. Other donations from students, lecturers and council members have been invaluable. All donations have provided materials for use in the courses offered by the Centre, enabling students access to relevant resources. Resource boxes for new courses have been set up. We also have another much needed bookshelf and a filing cabinet which were sourced by our colleague from the Refugee Language Program, Lesley Carnus.

Copies of students' dissertations were filed in alphabetical order by surname. Thanks to the hard work of Yang Zhang, a CPACS graduate, a list is now available for easier access to relevant topics. Yang has painstakingly listed them from 2001 to 2011, by year, author and title. Two copies of this compilation are filed with the dissertations and list is available on the CPACS website.

Through the diligence of Henora Tanto, IT Officer at School of Social and Political Sciences, the database is also on the university website, available to staff and students who can now search by author, title or subject to locate relevant items.
Membership Report

Neven Bondokji and Punam Yadav, Administrative Assistants

It is always a pleasure to welcome new members in the CPACS community. This year 13 new members joined CPACS. All the new members were given a free copy of *Taming War: Culture and Technology for Peace*, generously donated by the author, CPACS Council Member, Andrew Greig. Two of our members became life members and 42 renewed their memberships. We are thankful for the thirteen new memberships, life memberships and the renewal of 42 memberships.

The role of Membership Secretary has been managed by CPACS Administrative Assistants.

Life Membership Certificate for Ms Yvonne Walsh
CPACS Annual Report 2011

Publications

Neven Bondokji and Punam Yadav, Administrative Assistants and Publications Editors

Following the outstanding research performance in 2010, 2011 was also a very productive year for CPACS in terms of publications. Four books, twelve chapters in books and eleven referred journal articles were published by CPACS staff, students, graduates and visiting scholars. Similarly, one book review in a scholarly journal, one CPACS Occasional Paper and one research report were also published. Details of each these publications are listed below.


**Books**


**Book Chapters**


Journal Articles


http://www.wphna.org/2011_feb_wn3_comm_RUTF.htm

http://www.wphna.org/2011_oct_wn3_kent_breastfeeding.htm


URL: http://www.psychologyandsociety.ppsis.cam.ac.uk/currentissue


Book Review in Scholarly Journal


Occasional Paper


Research Report

Seminars and Events

Neven Bondokji and Punam Yadav, Administrative Assistants

CPACS has organized a number of events and seminars this year on various areas of relevance to peace with justice. CPACS has also hosted a number of visitors who addressed audiences based on personal experience and expertise. Below is a list of the events and dates.

Departmental Seminars:

CPACS held four departmental Seminars in May 2011 to discuss the research work currently undertaken by CPACS staff. These are:

- **Challenging Peace through Tourism**, Dr Lynda-ann Blanchard (4 May 2011)
- **A Global Standard for Reporting Conflict**, A/Prof Jake Lynch (11 May 2011)
- **Transforming High School Students into Peacebuilders: A Rationale for the Youth Peace Initiative Model of Peace Education**, Ms Susy Lee Deck (18 May 2011)
- **Locating Transitional Justice in Timor Leste: Politics, Participation and Peacebuilding**, Dr Wendy Lambourne (25 May 2011)

Seminars and Book Launches

*What the **ck is Going On?* Are We in an Era of War without End?*
Antony Loewenstein, A/Prof. Jake Lynch, and Michael Otterman
Seminar, 25 May 2011

*All Guns Blazing? Detention, Riots and Government (mis)Management*
Prof. Lynda Briskman and Lucy Fiske
Seminar, 17 June 2011

*Anatomy of an Occupation: The Indonesian Military in West Papua*
Dr. Jim Elmslie, Camellia Webb-Gannon, and Dr. Peter King
Report Launch by authors, 16 August 2011

*Justice and Hope for Forgotten Australians and Victims of the State ‘Care’ System*
A discussion on the two books: *Surviving Care: Achieving Justice and Healing for the Forgotten Australians* and *Recipes for Survival: Stories of Hope and Healing by Survivors of the State ‘Care’ System in Australia*
Book Launch, 28 September 2011
Time for Action on Sri Lanka War Crimes: Where Journalism Led, Will Governments Follow?
Senator Lee Rhiannon, Prof. Wendy Bacon, A/Prof. Jake Lynch, and Brami Jegan, Seminar, 27 October 2011

Seminars by CPACS Distinguished Visitors

Human Rights in Western Sahara: Africa’s Last Colony
Aicha Dahane, a Saharawi woman and human rights defender
17 May 2011

Musicians without Borders
Laura Hassler, Musicians without Borders
11 July 2011

US Nuclear Policy after the Nuclear Posture Review
Hans M. Kristensen, Director of Nuclear Information Project Federation of American Scientists
4 August 2011

Afghanistan Ten Years On: Time to Go?
Malalai Joya, Peace campaigner and former MP in Afghanistan
7 September 2011

Extrajudicial Killings, Disappearances and the Road to Lasting Peace in the Philippines
7 December 2011

CPACS Community Events
In addition to the welcome lunches and end of semester dinners usually organized by CPACS, in 2011 two special community events were organized.

An event was held on 21 September 2011 to commemorate and celebrate the life of Dr Stella Cornelius, Special Advisor to CPACS and a long serving advocate of peace. The event was hosted by CPACS and Sydney Peace Foundation with writer, broadcaster and filmmaker Ann Deveson as special guest speaker.

CPACS organized a Career Day on 26 May 2011 for CPACS students and graduates to discuss career opportunities. The event included contributions from CPACS alumni currently active in the fields of restorative justice, development, human rights and the UN.
Financial Statements

Neven Bondokji and Punam Yadav, Administrative Assistants

SSPS Finance Manager Maggie Ghali, and Finance Officer Danka Ondriskova have administered CPACS’ finances in 2011. CPACS wishes to thank Maggie and Danka for their continuous support.

The CPACS account structure remained the same as in 2010 with one Responsibility Centre, D5401, and further Project Codes. Some CPACS projects, such as the Sri Lanka Human Rights Project, the Refugee Language Programme and the West Papua Project, have their own separate accounts. Similarly, the two student prizes offered by CPACS have their own accounts and are funded by donations.

For the core CPACS activities, Project Code 00000 is the main operating account, which includes academic and administrative/general salaries in addition to operating expenses within the approved budget. PC 11111 is the other-operating account through which we channel income generated by CPACS through conferences, seminars, membership fees and publication sales. Donations are processed through the Advancement Office into this account as well.

The 2011 Financial Statement summarises all projects. It is a consolidation of the following categories:

(1) Income and Expenditure Summary
(2) Teaching and Learning account
(3) Research account
(4) Support account
(5) Professional Services account

Note: the summary does not include student fee income or grants by the Vice-Chancellor and Dean from discretionary funds.
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CPACS Financial Statement (summary)

I & E Statement (including Month & Prior Year) for Centre for Peace & Conflict (D5401)

User Selection:
Period: AdjPeriod
Year: Calendar Year 2011 Unit $: Scaling
Responsibility Centre: Centre for Peace & Conflict (D5401)
Project Codes: ALLPROJECTS_PJ
Analysis Codes: Analysis Codes
Report Date: 19-Jan-2012 12:51 PM
Report Data as of: 19 JAN 2012
Request Name: mghali
Data Source: uem
Report Ref: SUGLR545
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MONTH</th>
<th>Prior Year</th>
<th>YEAR-TO-DATE</th>
<th>FULL YEAR</th>
<th>FULL YEAR</th>
<th>FULL YEAR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>Prior Year</td>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>Actual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Student Fees</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Research Grants</td>
<td>34,248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Investment Income</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Donations and Bequests</td>
<td>6,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Consulting &amp; Contract Research</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Business and Commercial Income</td>
<td>11,352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Other Income</td>
<td>7,605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Internal Income</td>
<td>32,633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total revenue</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Total Revenue</td>
<td>92,338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenses: Employee Benefits</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Academic Salary Costs</td>
<td>442,218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Part Time Teaching Costs</td>
<td>124,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>General Salary Costs</td>
<td>5,643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Casual Salary Costs</td>
<td>58,422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Overtime Costs</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Annual Leave</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total employee benefits</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Total Employee Benefits</td>
<td>630,583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenses: Non Salary</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Employee Related Costs</td>
<td>46,763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Consumables</td>
<td>8,055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Repairs and Maintenance</td>
<td>2,701</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Equip Purchases &amp;Lease-$10,000</td>
<td>7,628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Utilities and Communications</td>
<td>7,301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Consultants and Contractors</td>
<td>47,551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Insurance, Legal, Motor, Admin</td>
<td>11,844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Student, Printing, Library</td>
<td>7,797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total non salary expenses</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Total Non Salary Expenses</td>
<td>139,639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total expenses</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Total Expenses</td>
<td>770,222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPERATING MARGIN</td>
<td>(677,884)</td>
<td>(108,409)</td>
<td>(314,417)</td>
<td>(677,884)</td>
<td>(60,682)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elimination and Extraod Items</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NET OPERATING MARGIN</td>
<td>(677,884)</td>
<td>(108,409)</td>
<td>(314,417)</td>
<td>(677,884)</td>
<td>(60,682)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Op Margin as a % of Total Revenue</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>(734.1%)</td>
<td>(14.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NET FINANCIAL PERFORMANCE</td>
<td>(677,884)</td>
<td>(108,409)</td>
<td>(314,417)</td>
<td>(677,884)</td>
<td>(60,682)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accumulations</td>
<td>Carry Forward (Prior Year)</td>
<td>(558,920)</td>
<td>(678,734)</td>
<td>(364,317)</td>
<td>(558,920)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLOSING BALANCE</td>
<td>(1,236,804)</td>
<td>(787,143)</td>
<td>(678,734)</td>
<td>(1,236,804)</td>
<td>(739,416)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESERVES</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>