CPACS Director, Associate Professor Jake Lynch, arrived in the UK in mid-November to take up a short term research fellowship at JOMEC, the School of Journalism, Media and Cultural Studies at Cardiff University. That weekend, France – and the whole of Europe – was horrified by news of the Islamic State attack on Paris, in which 130 people were killed. How were the issues reported in the media?

As a former BBC News reporter and presenter, Jake investigated the output of three key BBC programmes on television and radio. This article summarises his findings.

Three of the BBC’s most influential news programmes suppressed and marginalised a significant strand of thought in the debate on how Britain should respond to the so-called Islamic State group, in a key timeframe: the first three days of the week following the IS attacks in Paris, on November 13th.

This strand of thought can be summarised as the ‘Blowback’ thesis, after a famous book of the same name by Chalmers Johnson, a former CIA consultant who wrote how this word was freely used within the agency to refer to the unintended consequences of US foreign policies – but studiously kept from the public outside. In this case, the ‘Blowback’ effect refers to the emergence and growth of IS (or ISIS, Daesh or ISIL), in Iraq and Syria, as the unintended consequence of previous military interventions in the region. The implication is that this should make Britain and other countries cautious about engaging in further military interventions, lest the situation be exacerbated still further.
The BBC suppressed a significant strand of thought on Islamic State in a key timeframe: continued from the cover...

The ‘Blowback’ thesis was almost completely absent from the material selected for broadcast on two of the three programmes: *Today* on BBC Radio Four, and the *Six O’Clock News* on BBC television, while it was considered only very briefly on BBC Two’s *Newsnight*, in the episodes selected. (The approximate equivalents in Australia would be the ABC’s morning and drive time programmes on Radio National, and *Lateline* on ABC).

One of the effects of this pattern of coverage was to make Jeremy Corbyn, leader of Britain’s Opposition Labour Party, appear isolated in his opposition to British air-strikes in Syria, when in fact he was voicing a substantial segment of public opinion on the subject.

Three complete episodes of the agenda-setting *Today* programme, which went to air on the Monday, Tuesday and Wednesday following the Paris attacks (November 16-18) contained a total of 109 items pertaining to IS, and the debate over how Britain should respond. Of these items, four mentioned the ‘Blowback’ thesis in anything resembling the terms set out above, comprising just 129 words (or about 43 seconds) between them. Of these five mentions, only one was positive, a recorded clip comprising just 15 seconds of airtime) was the sole occasion of 15 seconds’ duration between them:

“Almost all the time I’ve held public office, there’s been that threat of violence, because of our military involvement”;

“When Tony Blair took his decision to invade Iraq, the security services warned both him and me, ‘this makes you a target for terrorism’ “.

However, these were in the context of an interview dominated by questions about his relationships with other party figures, and the cues they provided were not explored further. Later in the same episode, Tariq Ramadan, Oxford Professor of Contemporary Islamic Studies, spoke for 25 seconds about the double standards of western foreign policy as an obstacle to “solv[ing] the problem” of Islamist terrorism.

It meant that, in a total of 12 hours 45 minutes of broadcasting, just one minute and three seconds were allotted for the ‘blowback’ thesis to be even partially put forward.

This pattern of coverage directly contravenes a key provision of the BBC’s *Editorial Guidelines*, from Section 4, which deals with impartiality:

Q: What is Peace Journalism and how can it contribute to the peace process?

Peace Journalism is when editors and reporters make choices - of what stories to report, and how to report them - which create opportunities for society at large to consider and to value non-violent responses to conflict.

It uses conflict analysis and transformation to update the concepts of balance, fairness and accuracy in reporting.

The Peace Journalism approach provides a new road map tracing the connections between journalists, their sources, the stories they cover and the consequences of their reporting - the ethics of journalistic intervention.

Peace Journalism research is CPACS’ sole consistent source of major research outputs. Major research outputs being books (monographs and edited collections), edited special editions of scholarly journals, and themed conferences and seminars.

For more information visit our website: [http://goo.gl/YosaNu](http://goo.gl/YosaNu)
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We are committed to reflecting a wide range of opinion across our output as a whole and over an appropriate timeframe so that no significant strand of thought is knowingly unreflected or under-represented.

The timeframe selected for the gathering of data for this research – the first three days of the week following the Paris attacks – is appropriate, given polling evidence that this was a period in which public opinion was being formed on the question of whether Britain should join air strikes against IS in Syria. The Daily Mail led its edition of the Wednesday, November 18, with news from a poll it commissioned from the market research company, ComRes, for which fieldwork was conducted over the previous two days, which found 60% of respondents in favour.

The ‘Blowback’ thesis is a significant strand of thought. In further research conducted for this study, it was either proposed, or adduced as an established fact, in 21 out of 24 articles referring to “Islamic State”, in a representative sample generated by the ProQuest Worldwide Political Science Abstracts database of scholarly articles, from a date range covering the years 2014 and 2015. None of the articles attempted to refute it.

One of the articles in the sample was a review of three books on the subject, with reputable publishers, which appeared in the edition of Foreign Affairs magazine current at the time of the Paris attacks. All three concurred in one basic proposition, the reviewer remarked: “The rise of ISIS is, to some extent, the unintended consequence of Western intervention in Iraq”.

The comparison may be regarded as similar to that made in a famous segment of Al Gore’s Oscar-winning documentary, An Inconvenient Truth, in which an onscreen graphic shows that, of 928 articles in peer-reviewed scholarly journals, none disagreed with the proposition that “greenhouse gas pollution has caused most of the global warming of the last 50 years”. By contrast, of newspaper articles published over the previous 14 years, 53% implied there was doubt about the cause of global warming.

As with the debate over IS, the Paris attacks and how Britain should respond, the overwhelming weight of specialist scholarly opinion directly contradicted the impression clearly given by journalism. An important difference between the two cases is that, in data considered for the present study, the journalism was by the BBC, which – unlike newspapers – has formal public service obligations to maintain due impartiality and balance in the presentation of current affairs.

The nature of the BBC’s coverage will be of particular concern to Labour leader Jeremy Corbyn and his supporters. Several items on the Today programme were live studio spots by reporters from the Corporation’s Westminster office, all of which addressed Mr Corbyn’s difficulties in managing his own parliamentary party. In one of them, broadcast shortly before 8am on the Tuesday (November 17), the BBC’s Political Editor, Laura Kuenssberg observed that, while in disagreement with many MPs, Mr Corbyn: “does have huge support in the Labour Party”, and moreover that “many members of the public do find what he says refreshing, principled and something that they want to hear more of”.

On the topic under discussion, this latter point is, if anything, reinforced by evidence from opinion polling conducted since the parliamentary vote on British airstrikes in Syria. By then, the public were, apparently, coming round in increasing numbers to Mr Corbyn’s view:

“A YouGov opinion poll conducted the day after Parliament approved airstrikes, December 3, found that just 44 percent of Britons approve of the action – a dramatic drop from the 60 percent who backed the measures on November 24”.

Despite this, the distinct overall impression given by BBC coverage in the key timeframe considered in this research, in three of its most important programmes, was that Mr Corbyn, in his opposition to British airstrikes in Syria, was isolated and “extreme”. The effect is reminiscent of that described by US media scholar Daniel Hallin, in his classic account of reporting Vietnam, The Uncensored War, by confining such opposition to a “zone of deviancy” – unworthy of being taken seriously – and thereby excluding it from the “zone of legitimate controversy [which] marks out and defends the limits of acceptable conflict [by] exposing, condemning, or excluding from the public agenda those who violate or challenge the political consensus”.

This was unjustified, given the disposition of public, political and specialist scholarly opinion, especially by a news organisation with the BBC’s public service role and obligations.

CPACS Director, Associate Professor Jake Lynch

**References from this article are available from the writer on request

Teaching Peace Journalism

Peace Journalism is the ‘big idea’ in one of the Arts Faculty’s most popular courses, Conflict-resolving Media, PACS6914, which is taught by Jake Lynch and Annabel McGoldrick.

Lynch and McGoldrick draw on their long experience of reporting on conflict, illustrated by their own original classroom materials, and of running professional training courses for editors and reporters in many countries including Indonesia, The Philippines, Nepal, Israel, Palestine, Georgia and Armenia.

Students have a go at re-writing the story of a bombing, as peace journalism, then record their own television interview, as Lynch subjects them to best BBC interviewing techniques! The course is suitable for anyone who is interested in media and their role in conflict and peace, actual and potential.

For more information visit our website: http://goo.gl/qPTuol
What kind of police force do we want?
Laura Gilmartin

In 2014 I set out to conduct a study which asks ‘Why do New South Wales Police Force (NSWPFF) officers routinely carry firearms?’ The study was to contribute to the Police Guns Project. This project had been initiated by Andrew Greig, sometime visiting scholar and member of the Centre for Peace and Conflict Studies (CPACS) Council. As the Coordinator of the Nonlethal Security for Peace Campaign, Andrew has spent years researching the many non-lethal alternatives to the lethal weapons currently used by countries around the world, asking why these non-lethal approaches are not developed as viable alternatives that could dramatically lessen the rates of death and serious injury both during and outside war. In Australia, we are reminded every day that the government sanctions the carriage of one such lethal weapon – a firearm – by those charged with maintaining law and order: the police. It therefore seemed appropriate to investigate on what basis this policy currently exists.

It especially seemed right to ask why it is the case in NSW (and indeed, every state in Australia) that police are routinely armed, when it is not so for one of our closest neighbours, New Zealand. New Zealand is one of the few countries in the world (the others being England, Wales, Scotland, Southern Ireland and Norway) whose police do not carry firearms during general duties. New Zealand Police (NZP) have access to firearms in locked cabinets in patrol cars and can gain access to firearms after receiving permission from superiors when they respond to particular incidents. As I undertook research for the project it became clear that NZP was deliberately maintaining a tradition of unarmed policing whereby members of the public could not see firearms on their police as they walked neighbourhoods, responded to motor vehicle accidents and investigated family violence incidents, among many other tasks they complete as part of general duties. I asked how two countries with such similar histories and contemporary issues could have developed such different policies.

One of the reasons appears to be that the majority of New Zealanders do not want their police to be routinely armed. A 2010 survey in the New Zealand Herald found 65 per cent of people in New Zealand wish for their police to remain routinely unarmed, but with ready access to armed back-up. NZP appears to use this kind of feedback in a meaningful way. The New Zealand Police Act Review of 2008 allowed New Zealanders to discuss the kind of police service they want and give them a voice in drafting the legislation that would create it. (See Hamish McCrindle and Mike Webb, ‘Inviting Public Conversations about Policing’, 2010). By contrast, nothing in my research indicated that either NSW or Victoria Police forces had ever undertaken a consultation process like this. However, I could not be sure, so I went directly to the forces in NSW and Victoria to ask them to take part in the research. I wanted to ask, ‘On what basis did your organisation decide to bring in a policy of routinely carrying firearms?’ and especially, ‘Is this policy based on evidence of what works best?’ My questions were, I explained, based on the assumption that it is in the best interests of any government body to understand the basis for their policies regarding force, and review them regularly. However, both Victoria Police and NSWPF have declined to participate in the research. A representative of Victoria Police stated that the force has been armed since its inception in 1853, the policy has not been reviewed since and he did not feel the research would benefit the force. NSWPF has not provided us with...
any reasons for its decision not to participate.

Therefore, we were forced to fall back on our research, which showed that there have been almost no studies conducted which conclusively demonstrate that routinely carrying firearms makes police or the public either more or less safe. One of the few statistical studies in existence was conducted by Hawkins and Ward, who, in 1970, found evidence to suggest police officers are less at risk of being shot and killed while not carrying a firearm. One of the reasons why evidence of this kind is so hard to come by appears to be that there are so many variables to consider that it would be difficult to claim the outcomes with confidence. This is perhaps why Hawkins and Ward’s hypothesis has not been revisited by any researchers since.

So we asked, ‘Without a strong evidence base, what should guide a decision about routine carriage?’ University of South Australia Professor Rick Sarre said in 1996 in relation to uniform gun laws following the Port Arthur Massacre, that in lieu of any real evidence it is better to err on the side of restraint and to remove from society the ‘most obvious and potentially odious symbol of modern violence’. Should the police not be held to the same standard? Many would surely argue the police are subject to different standards than the public – after all, they are responsible for law and order and must have all the resources they need in order to maintain it. However, when firearms are needed, New Zealand police officers appear to have all the access that they require. It is their tradition of unarmed policing that has kept them unarmed and this has more to do with their understanding of their role and their relationship with the public than anything else.

The relationship between the police and the public appears to be defined by the style of policing adopted by the organisation in question. As penal colonies, administrations in early colonial NSW and Victoria utilised a military style of policing modelled on the Royal Irish Constabulary. The same is true of New Zealand. Police forces in both places were charged with ‘controlling’ indigenous populations and mediating the often violent relationships between traditional owners and settlers during settlement. However, in an effort to distinguish themselves from the frontiersman image of Australia, New Zealand started ed to adopt a Peelian style of policing in the 1890s, in which police considered their role to be one of consultation with, rather than control of, the public. The Peelian style of policing is named after Robert Peel, the former Prime Minister of the United Kingdom who is widely regarded as the founder of modern policing. This style of policing came about as a reaction of the British public to the very idea of being policed - many were afraid it would mean the erosion of their civil liberties. As a result, Peel developed a style of policing in which police were kept from professionalising to the degree that their authority separated them from the general populace. Police were dressed much the same as male citizens, in long-tail coats and top hats rather than helmets, and carried a wooden truncheon rather than a firearm. They patrolled the streets of London in much the same way as the night watchmen that had kept the populace safe before them. Many publications claim Australian police forces have also followed a Peelian tradition; however, when compared with New Zealand, we can see there is limited truth to this argument. The Peelian tradition is premised on the very idea that police are there to protect the public, not view them with suspicion. Conversely, the message sent in all states of Australia is that police officers are so at risk from the public that they must be armed at all times.

In lieu of evidence to support either policy, I considered that the next best option must be a consultation process which allows members of the NSW public to consider what kind of police force they want and contribute to its policy-making, in much the same way as the NZP. Such a process would allow citizens to consider the full range of weapons carried by police, both lethal and non-lethal and allow us to consider how close or separate we want the police to be to the public. Such a process would place greater control over the use of force by police, into the hands of the public they are responsible for serving.

Laura Gilmartin completed the Master of Peace and Conflict Studies coursework degree in 2014.

How does Creators for Peace work?

A group will meet over two days and an evening to work through a series of topics and exercises designed to increase awareness of participants’ own peacemaking potential and share stories with each other in an atmosphere of trust and respect.

The first Creators of Peace Circle was offered at CPACS in March 2014. Subsequent Peace Circles have been run in November 2014, April 2015, and February 2016, and are open to all genders. These Peace Circles are co-facilitated by CPACS Council members and members of the CPACS Peace Praxis Working Group, Shoshana Faire and Patricia Garcia.

Shoshana is a well know pioneer of conflict resolution in Australia and co-author of the best-selling book on conflict resolution Everyone Can Win: How to Resolve Conflict. Patricia has significant experience working with conflict-affected communities in Sydney and has more than twenty years experience in the international humanitarian aid field.

For more information about Creators of Peace, view our website: http://goo.gl/D8i1u3

Or contact: Shoshana Faire, Professional Facilitator, Council Member, Centre for Peace and Conflict Studies shoshanafaire@icloud.com
Patricia Garcia, Visiting Scholar, Council Member, Centre for Peace and Conflict Studies patricia.garcia@sydney.edu.au

**References from this article are available from the writer on request.**
There are a number of peace museums and ‘peace centres’ around the world, but so far no major ones in Australia. A CPACS peace museum is now on our agenda, with a museum committee, chaired by CPACS Council Member Peter Herbron, looking at various possibilities.

The committee has already had some useful discussion with experts in the area.

I recently visited several peace centres in three different countries: Japan, Germany and India. Here are some of my observations:

First of all some brief impressions of the museums and centres:

HIROSHIMA
The most prominent peace centre in Japan is of course in Hiroshima. The main museum is well set up with excellent displays about the atomic bombing of the city in 1945, with photos, dioramas and videos. Highly compelling are various objects like some glass bottles that were melted by the heat of the explosion.

The other complementary theme of the museum is on ‘how do we stop it happening again?’ There is a range of displays, including various historical documents that outline strategies for peace.

The Museum with various memorials is set in the very attractive peace park.

A prominent feature of the peace park is the Atomic Bomb Dome. This was directly under the blast but the structure somehow mostly survived. The building has been left as a ruin – you can’t go inside the walls – but in many ways it’s the most striking feature of the whole site.

(By the way - if you haven’t been there - despite its terrible history, modern day Hiroshima is a pleasant cheerful town with an excellent tram system. Just a very short ferry trip from the town is the highly picturesque little island of Miyajama, with some wonderful unspoiled temples.)

TOKYO
The Kanto Memorial Earthquake Museum, in the Ryogoku district commemorates the Tokyo earthquake of 1923 in which well over 100,000 people perished, the majority in a fire which swept through an area where they thought they’d taken safe refuge.

It’s a rather old fashioned museum (dark wooden display cases) with photos, documents and artefacts illustrating the event. Outside the museum is an attractive Japanese garden and a memorial temple. Following the allied bombing of Japan in 1945, which killed large numbers of people – many of them also in a firestorm - the mission of the Earthquake museum was extended to include this event.

(There are various other earthquake museums in Tokyo and other parts of Japan, some with ‘earthquake simulators’.)

BERLIN
As you may know, Berlin has scores of museums, a number of which could qualify as ‘peace museums’. These include the excellent Jewish Museum and the maze-like Holocaust Memorial near the Brandenburg Gate. (There’s also a very small meditation room almost beside the Gate).

There are two centres that I want to mention in particular. One is the Kathe Kollwitz gallery in Charlottenburg. Kathe was an artist and one of Germany’s most well-known peace activists. A part of the Mitte area of Berlin is named after her. She lost close relatives in both World Wars. Kathe’s pictures very much reflect her concern with the effects of warfare on people.

While visiting the gallery I viewed a temporary exhibition of photos from the collection of Ernst Friedrich. I found out that he was a remarkable peace activist and had set up an anti-war museum in the 1920s. Not surprisingly when Adolf Hitler came to power the museum was closed down (and apparently - with particular malevolence - the building was used as an SS torture centre).

Friedrich escaped to the Netherlands, joined the resistance and survived the war. He was still active in peace issues up to his death in France in 1967. In recognition a new Anti-Kriegs (Anti-war) museum has been opened in the Wedding district of Berlin which I
went to visit. It’s in a small house, fairly modest and run by volunteers. However it’s well set up and there’s an excellent introductory video.

DELHI
The Gandhi Smriti museum is located where Gandhi lived his final weeks and was assassinated. The final path from his room is marked with ‘footsteps’. The house preserves his room and has an excellent display of his life and work. Overall the museum and garden have a marvellous tranquility.

IDEAS
From this brief experience, I’ve come to a few conclusions about a Sydney Peace Museum:

- An initial small museum – like the Anti-Kriegs Museum in Berlin – is quite feasible. Sydney University might well have some unused space – maybe just a couple of rooms - which could be a short-term location for the museum. This would provide an opportunity to put the museum on the map as it were and to have something to show potential sponsors. The room or rooms could be looked after by volunteers.

- The museum – however big – should have free entry.

- A garden or gardens would be very desirable. This could contain sculptures and perhaps objects damaged in war. Parks around the world often proudly display field guns and other weapons. (Somewhat ironically when you think about it, there’s a gun at the corner of Hyde Park in Sydney, less than a hundred metres or so from the War Memorial.)

- Part of the museum could be out-of-doors, with perhaps some of the exhibits under a cloister (as in the Gandhi museum). In the long term, extensive grounds would be excellent.

- The museum or centre should be child-friendly (and indeed attractive to all young people). One of the best museums I have seen recently was the Outdoor Art Museum at Hakone in Japan. It’s not a peace museum, but a fabulous museum of mostly outdoor sculpture and paintings (which are indoors in pavilions). The museum is very child-friendly with sculptures designed for kids to play on and other play centres. Interactive displays and experiences for young people would be very important.

- A cafe with good wholesome drink and food at reasonable prices would be another attraction.

IN SUMMARY
There are many good reasons for a peace museum associated with CPACS. It would be something that made peace issues more tangible to the general community. Galleries and museums are attractive to donors because they can see where their money goes.

So looking forward to a vision of our peace museum in a few years’ time, it could include:

- Excellent displays of the issues of warfare, conflict and peace
- Educative but entertaining interactive displays
- Child and youth friendly arrangements
- Extensive outdoor areas, with gardens, sculptures and playgrounds
- A strong program of seminars, individual lectures, courses of study, conferences and other public events
- Good public transport connections
- A high quality café - and of course
- A central role for CPACS.

Andrew Greig is a Council Member of the Centre for Peace and Conflict Studies

Artefacts from the Anti-Kriegs (Anti-war) Museum.
Photo Credit: Andrew Greig

Where Gandhi was assassinated preserved within the Ghandi Smriti Museum.
Photo Credit: Andrew Greig

Gandhi’s final footsteps in the Gandhi Smriti Museum.
Photo Credit: Andrew Greig
Against a Pre-Figurative Politics of Doing
Tim Bryar

Many social movements make the claim that their actions directly show that ‘this is what democracy looks like’. For example this slogan was central to the Seattle anti-globalization protests at the end of last century, and research on the Arab Spring movement shows how Egyptian activists claimed Tahrir Square “was really a mini-example of what democracy looks like” (Chabot and Sharifi 2013). More than simply reflecting an explanation of the empirical facts of the situation, such claims are based upon the theoretical concept of pre-figuration. Simply put, pre-figuration is when the methods of action anticipate or replicate in advance the desired goal (Martin 2008). Therefore, “if the goal is a society without organized violence, nonviolent action has all these prefigurative advantages. It provides experiences in living without using violence; it reduces immediate violence in the here and now, even when campaigns fail; and it ensures that efforts are in a nonviolent direction” (Martin 2008, p. 5).

Many social movement scholars argue that prefiguration is the most strategic and effective means for bringing about the transformation of capitalist society (e.g. Maekelbergh 2011; Springer 2015). A key aspect of pre-figurative politics is that it rejects the idea of a two-step process based on the removal of unjust power that then enables the space for the creation of a new society. For example, in contrast to Sharpian nonviolent political action aimed at overthrowing dictatorships, Chabot and Sharifi (2013) argue that nonviolent movements should experiment in a Gandhian ‘constructive programme’ in order to create alternatives to neoliberal-capitalism. Similarly, Maekelbergh discusses how prefiguration captures the shift in the focus of social movements away from a conquering of the society towards the process of building something new. In this way, she claims, pre-figuration is about doing.

The fundamental principles of this pre-figurative politics of doing are inclusion, participation and diversity supported by a horizontal power structure. For example, Chenoweth and Stephan’s (2011) argument that nonviolent revolutions are more likely to lead to non-violent democratic outcomes when compared to violent movements is based upon the conclusion that broad based participation during the nonviolent campaigns is important for reinforcing a ‘peaceful’ post-revolutionary liberal-democratic society. Maekelbergh (2011) argues that the aim of pre-figurative politics is to create more inclusive forms of democracy that directly challenge liberal-representative democracy. She claims, “This deep and open inclusion is achieved through connectivity, where connectivity is communication characterized by reciprocal contamination”.

Jodi Dean argues that today we live in an era of ‘Communicative Capitalism’ characterised by a “specific convergence of capitalism and democracy, where the values once heralded as central to democracy take material form in networked communication technologies”. She therefore asks, “if participation and debate – sharing and exchanging ideas, mobilizing politically, dissenting, even revolting – are primary components of the production and circulation of capital, what efficacy do they have as mechanisms for the rule of the people?” (Dean 2014, p. 148). Indeed, Dean (2005, p. 62) argues that the emphasis on participation and inclusion is a fantasy whereby technology functions as a fetish covering over our impotence and helping us understand ourselves as active”. Therefore, Dean (2009) argues democracy is inadequate as a language and frame for revolutionary politics because it employs and reinforces the rhetoric of capitalism, such as free choice, diversity, liberty and connection. That is, communicative capitalism is precisely what ‘democracy looks like’.

In this way, one should challenge Maekelbergh’s (2011) claims that pre-figurative politics is not based on a pre-determined notion of society. Rather, based on the Lacanian notion of the big Other, we can see how pre-

---

**The Effects of Conflict**

**Q: What is the Reconnecting Communities in Conflict Project?**

The *Reconnecting Communities in Conflict* project is about empowerment - giving voice and creating a space to encourage communication at home, on the street and within the community in general. In doing so, parents can reconnect with their children and join together to create a better environment for healthy discussions around topics that might otherwise be neglected for political, religious or cultural reasons.

The *Reconnecting Communities in Conflict* project is also about reintroducing the skills of parenting to parents. Generally, traditional families tend to shut children out of adult discussions. As a result, children look for education (continued on pg. 8)
politics which opens up a new space out-of which parasitizes upon what it negates, to a negation of the explicit demands of politics. Bartelby’s gesture of refusal is not just a refusal to participate, but also a refusal to partake acts of reproduction. Therefore, according to Vighi (2010), the goal of a politics of doing nothing is to gain a distance from the relentless and obscene (shameless) call to participate creatively and proactively in a system whose only goal is to reproduce itself and, collaterally, global misery.

Thus, Badiou (2012) argues that the only valid thing on offer is the natural harmony between unbridled capitalism and Western democracy. Therefore, against a pre-figurative politics of horizontal inclusion and participation – a politics of doing – one should insist on a politics of doing nothing that is strictly linked to exclusion. Such a politics is based on Zizek’s ‘Bartleby politics’. The term ‘Bartleby’ is derived from Herman Melville’s short story titled ‘Bartleby, the Scrivener: A Story of Wall-street’ in which the main character, Bartleby, repeatedly responds to the demands of his boss with the statement ‘I’d prefer not to’. Bartelby’s gesture of refusal is not just a negation of the explicit demands of power, but also a refusal to partake acts of resistance/transgression. As Zizek (2006, p. 393) argues, “This is how we pass from the politics of ‘resistance’ or ‘protestation’, which parasitizes upon what it negates, to a politics which opens up a new space outside the hegemonic position and its negation…” Therefore, a politics of doing nothing...

What is Reconnecting Communities in Conflict?: continued...

and information from other sources, including from their peers and the internet.

Reconnecting Communities in Conflict is about humanising the ‘other’ and giving our supposed ‘enemies’ a human face. Reconnecting Communities in Conflict is also about seeing conflict through a positive lens. Conflict is a cry for positive change. It is about enabling people from different sides of the fence to create friendships, understanding and discussion, without judgment. More simply put, to accept that others may share a world view different to our own.

Patricia Garcia and Abe Quadan, members of CPACS’ Peace Praxis Working Group, have significant experience working with conflict-affected communities in Sydney. Patricia has been working with the South Sudanese community since the eruption of civil war in December 2013. In February 2014, she organised a seminar at CPACS to mobilise the South Sudanese diaspora community to support the peace process in South Sudan. Abe established a Dialogue Group for Jewish and Palestinians that has been running for 5 years, and has also facilitated and supported a Sri Lanka Dialogue Group.

Following discussions with representatives from the Great Lakes diaspora communities including Rwanda, Burundi, Congo and Uganda, Patricia and Abe started the Reconnecting Communities in Conflict project in early 2015 by organising a pilot workshop.

For more information, visit our website: http://goo.gl/HieyBm

**References from this article are available from the writer on request.**
History is filled with efforts to suppress stories which challenge powerful people and powerful institutions. Fourteen years ago a frightened Sydney University management schemed to stop a prominent Palestinian leader from appearing in the Great Hall where she would have received an international peace prize and been able to tell the story of a massacre.

The story of these sensational events is revealed in *A Lover’s Country*, a novel in which faction is mixed with fiction. Sandwiched between a passionate love affair between a university researcher and his much younger former student, the story is set in that climate of fear which followed the Iraq war and the post 9/11 war on terror.

*A Lover’s Country* is peppered with poetry and with revelations about the courage needed to resist a culture of intrigue and cowardice. In many chapters, Sydney University is centre stage. The story contains more than a hint that the current corporate hi-jacking of the university should come as no surprise.

The novel, by Stuart Rees, former Professor of Social Work & Social Policy & Director of the Centre for Peace & Conflict Studies, was launched by Mary Kostakidis in Sydney’s Gleebooks on April 12th, by Palestinian playwright Samah Sabawi in Readings of Melbourne on April 20th and by Federal Labour MP Melissa Parke in Fremantle’s New Editions bookshop on May 18th.

**Stuart Rees is a Professor Emeritus at the University of Sydney, Co-Founder of CPACS and the Founder of the Sydney Peace Foundation**

---

**Launching A Lover’s Country**

**Juliet Bennett**

After a decade of anticipation, Emeritus Professor Stuart Rees launched his twelfth book and first fiction work, *A Lover’s Country* at Gleebooks on Tuesday evening, 12th April. Stuart is a co-founder of the Centre for Peace and Conflict Studies at the University of Sydney, and the founder of the Sydney Peace Foundation. The evening was lively and inspiring, hosted by iconic SBS World News presenter Mary Kostakidis and showcasing Stuart’s inimitable charismatic style. There was standing room only, and glasses were full.

Singer and musician Abby Dobson opened the night with her striking voice and acoustics, encouraging us to “rise up” and love “even when … sleeping”. Then the eloquent, always-charming host introduced the book and explained Stuart’s journey to get it published. This was followed by a Q&A between Mary and Stuart, examining the interface of fact and fiction in the book, before opening up for questions from the audience.

The title "A Lover's Country" comes from a poem entitled “Beirut” by Mahmoud Darwish (the national poet of the Palestinian people), from where he hoped one day to build “a lover’s country.” The book itself is a fiction (or “faction”) that unfolds through a passionate love story between a former Australian journalist, Tom Markson and his much younger Jewish lover Naomi Branath. Peppered with poetry and with visions of a fairer world, the book carries an important message about having the courage to take a stand for peace with justice.
The love story is wrapped around a plot loosely based on true events that took place in 2003, when the Sydney Peace Prize was awarded to Palestinian scholar and human rights activist Dr Hanan Ashrawi. The story captures the resilience of the Sydney Peace Foundation in standing up to sectors of the Australian community who withdrew their support and attempted to get Stuart and his colleagues to retract the Prize.

In the book, a group of people resist a powerful lobby which wants to stop a distinguished Palestinian leader, Fadieela Qubra, from receiving an international award for peace and thereby having the chance to tell the story of the murder of a Palestinian journalist, and of a massacre in a Palestinian refugee camp. Its rich characters expose cowardice and compliance, be it by politicians, university managers, or the media, as well as illustrating the alternative possibilities for people to rise to seek justice.

Stuart reaffirmed his hope that the novel would inform a wider audience than an academic one, about the means of achieving human rights for all Palestinians.

Fiction as a vehicle for advancing the cause of a just world has some noble precedents. This book will undoubtedly strengthen that tradition.

Juliet Bennett is a PhD Candidate and Sessional Lecturer at the Centre for Peace and Conflict Studies. She worked for the Sydney Peace Foundation from 2012-2016, as Executive Officer and then Acting Director.

A Lover’s Country:
A Review
Wendy Lambourne

On 12 April 2016, the upstairs of Sydney’s Gleebooks was buzzing with an enthusiastic crowd eager to welcome the long-awaited book by Stuart Rees exposing the behind-the-scenes story that accompanied the courageous determination to bring Palestinian activist Dr Hanan Ashrawi to Australia to receive the 2003 Sydney Peace Prize. While it’s not entirely clear what is fact and what is fiction in the novel expertly crafted by the author, what does come through is the loud and consistent true story of unjust suffering of innocent Palestinians and the orchestrated campaign to prevent the award going ahead.

A list of characters is conveniently provided upfront to assist the reader in following the story, and helps to avoid confusion, especially for those of us who might be distracted by trying to work out who each character in the novel is representing from the original real life saga. Each character is a composite of faction and fiction, but the analogies are clear in terms of the various roles played by human rights activists, academics, journalists, Peace Prize jurists, politicians and power brokers, and the significance of being Jewish, Palestinian and/or Australian.

The writing is evocative and the story compelling. Visual details of each of the characters’ appearance and clothes, the food and drink that sustains them and the environment that surrounds them, make the novel accessible and engaging. Nothing much is left to the imagination, which for some might be disappointing, but for this reader was very much appreciated as providing an easy step into the world created by the author – and helping to avoid the dangers of direct comparison with the real characters and events whilst at the same time evoking familiar images and impressions.

The snatches of poetry peppered throughout the narrative are nicely contextualised, adding to the imagery and providing insight into the main character’s perspectives on life, such as the lines from Wordsworth which inspired him driving through the quiet early morning streets of London. The title A Lover’s Country makes reference to an inspiring image from a poem by significant Palestinian poet Mahmoud Darwish which is quoted by Palestinian human rights leader Dr Fadieela Qubra (the character based on Dr Hanan Ashrawi) in the closing pages of the book: ‘From a stone, we’ll build a lover’s country’.

As this is a novel, I am not going to give away any more about the plot or the ending, other than to say that it starts with a murder and a massacre, and continues with a love story that envelops the main narrative which – despite the glimmerings of hope which pervade the final chapters of the book – is still depressingly relevant today in its depiction of Palestinian suffering and the resistance of those who feel threatened by the potential acknowledgement of responsibility.

Mostly I feel angry, as does the main protagonist in this novel, at the continuing atrocities and lack of compassion of those who use power and influence to try to silence those who take a stand against injustice. But I also feel sorrow and dismay that a group of people who were so cruelly driven from their lands, subject to pogroms and discrimination, and the victims of the world’s most horrendous genocide, should be so determined to defend and deny their perpetration of human rights crimes against another group of people. And at the same time, as our recent Master of Peace and Conflict Studies graduate, Shamikh Badra, from Gaza so bravely concluded: there is also an urgent need to reconcile and admit mistakes within the Palestinian parties to this long-running conflict.

To repeat an old adage that seems particularly pertinent: two wrongs don’t make a right. Nor do they make peace. Only mutual acknowledgement of pain and suffering, and taking shared responsibility for a different relationship in the future, can do that. In the book, Dr Fadieela Qubra provides an example by referring not only to the killings of Palestinians, but also to the need to mourn the loss of Israeli lives. What is not mentioned is the huge bouquet of flowers from a Jewish group in Sydney that took pride of place beside the real Dr Ashrawi as she spoke in the overflowing Seymour Centre just across the road from the University of Sydney on Wednesday 5 November 2003.

This short review was written by Dr Wendy Lambourne, Deputy Director of CPACS, who was there in November 2003 when Dr Hanan Ashrawi was welcomed to Sydney and allowed to speak about the plight of her people and the need to focus on nonviolence as a means to ending the conflict and building a peace with justice.
**Shetland to Scilly— New Technologies for Peace Journey**

Andrew Greig

All going to plan, by the time you read this I’ll be about to begin a journey from the Shetland Isles at the northern tip of Scotland to the Isles of Scilly at the southwestern tip of England. I may even have started.

The purpose of the trip is to promote the idea of using new technologies for peace. My argument will be that lethal warfare is outdated and that we need to change to nonlethal technology in resolving conflict between nations. Just as the technology of energy from fossil fuel needs to be replaced, so does our current technology of lethal warfare.

To underline the parallel, I’ll try to minimise my use of fossil fuelled transport and (assuming my limbs hold out!) travel as much as possible on foot, by bicycle and perhaps, from time to time, by kayak.

During the journey I’ll be talking to a wide range of people including community groups, the military, peace activists, politicians, journalists and schoolchildren … in fact anyone who might have an interest in the matter. I’ve already started to make contact with such groups along the route and there’s definitely a good deal of enthusiasm about discussing the idea.

The concept of using nonlethal devices instead of bullets and bombs is not without its problems. For a start, there’s not much of the technology yet available. As well, a number of peace activists feel uncomfortable about the idea. They argue that constraining another human – even if you don’t kill or severely injure them – is an act of violence and that achieving peace must be by non-violent means.

I can understand this viewpoint and it’s an issue that needs ongoing discussion. My argument, though, is that in the long run, we must strive for a world that is peaceful and non-violent in every respect. We should also try to achieve this state of affairs with as little violence as possible. However, the world is a complex place. Like it or not, for the foreseeable future at least there will be those who will try to attack, abuse or bully others. In the civil area we include among them violent criminals and psychopaths. I suggest that such individuals at times require physical constraint. On the international front, there are equivalent individuals and groups – dictators and invading armies for example - who can also be described as criminal or psychopathic. The principles of nonlethal security assert that such individuals and groups may need to physically constrained but without killing them and with the minimum of violence. Taking no action to restrain such people would allow much worse violence to occur. Reducing the damage of war will promote a culture of peace.

I’m looking forward to discussing these and many other issues with all the people I’ll meet on the way. I’m also looking forward to travelling through some scenic areas of Britain. Which brings me to why I’m making the journey through Britain and not Australia. The answer is that much as I love this splendid southern continent and my home city of Sydney, the UK is an appropriate place right now for such a campaign. Unfortunately perhaps for those who live there, war and conflict are closer to their doorstep. The nuclear deterrent - with the proposed replacement of the Trident nuclear armed submarine system - is a huge issue, with the majority of Scots being opposed to the presence of the submarine base at Faslane near Glasgow. The activities of NATO, relationships with Russia and intervention in the Middle East are all on the agenda – not to mention the refugee question.

And talking of questions – a journey through Australia with the same purpose sometime in the future is not out of the question. Let’s just see first how this one goes!

I’ll be posting the progress of the journey on the event website www.shetlandtoscillyforpeace.com And of course, if you happen to be in the UK during the period May to July please get in touch so that you can visit and perhaps even travel with us for some of the way.

Andrew Greig is a Council Member of the Centre for Peace and Conflict Studies

---

The Human Survival Project

A current CPACS supported project is the Human Survival Project that aims to disarm, with reason and passion, all nuclear possessing states and general nuclear complacency. The HSP hopes save humanity from a nuclear holocaust that could effect all living and sentient beings including the environment, undertake and encourage research in neglected areas of nuclear survival concern and help bring about radically new policy settings and peoples, governments and global civil society to cope with the master threat of nuclear war. With the foundation of CPACS values, HSP strives to transform the global mentality towards nuclear affairs because it must be the guiding light for advocacy and research, in order to comprehend and overcome the danger of denying, ignoring, overlooking, minimizing or rationalizing our common nuclear danger.

For more information visit our website: http://goo.gl/gmuR7q
Deep Friendship and Dear Dalai Lama: Considerable Contributions and Tributes
Lindsay Mell

Such warm forthright testimonies of profound respect and affection comprise the truly beautiful sentiments of those who contributed to the recent Dear Dalai Lama tribute (2015).

These substantial testimonies were sensitively compiled by Tenpa Dugdak, with Karen Collier, through the auspices of the Centre for Peace and Conflict Studies, with a delightful ‘Foreword’ from Emeritus Professor Stuart Rees.

They are celebratory perspectives which introduce and invoke the great tolerance and courage of the Dalai Lama throughout his, at times, volatile 80 years of experience and realise, what is a profound tribute.

Meanwhile, over the course of some 20 years, those who have resiliently dedicated considerable time and effort to what is the United Nations Association of Australia (NSW) Community Project have sought to introduce and invoke the great tolerance and courage of the Dalai Lama throughout his life journeys.

Evolved through the essential principle that any life lived distinctively and authentically in pursuit of a noble cause is a worthy life, this profound Deep Friendship study series validates and celebrates various human contributions from this resonant perspective.

It is particularly gratifying to have the opportunity here of sharing some substantial perspectives on these Deep Friendship studies, as such a discursive window is somewhat rare.

This is because only relatively limited prospects seem available for feasibly expounding and exploring such material in-depth, whereas this is possible given our well-informed Peace Writes readership.

Probably the optimal way to impart what proceeds through these warmly affirmative tributes is to refer at the outset briefly to ‘The Peace Activist’s Journey’ Panel Session Overview reported in the October 2015 edition of Peace Writes.

Given the specific content of this collaborative CPACS/ UNAA (NSW) Panel Session, what could be relevantly gleaned and inferred from this session is that it provided the means through which Marty Branagan, Paul Duffill and Martyn King, especially, could relate, and thereby share candidly, the distinctive inimical circumstances and situations of their authentic activist learning life journeys.

Indeed, incisive commentary and elucidation from Dr Anne Noonan enabled the insights and material shared to be considered through an inherently cogent perspectival lens which was definitively pertinent to the whole genre of the UNAA Community Project Deep Friendship studies.

Essentially, this pertained to the elemental quality of resonance as this tended to reverberate throughout the broad context of the respective Life Journey circumstances realised by those concerned.

Through her generous reference to what is the ever perennial pivotal theme of the Deep Friendship tributes which I compile, Anne Noonan discerned aptly ‘… th[is] sense of resonance’ as a ‘quality’ which I ‘put … out there consistently’, and which was ‘an interpretive dimension of the transpersonal to guide us through’ our learning life journeys, collectively and personally.

Such is the actual implicit terrain traversed through these Deep Friendship tributes.

Resolutely, such ‘interpretive dimension of the transpersonal’ is why I prefer to situate at least my substantial contributions to the Deep Friendship series as documentary tributes, and why I commit so much fine-grained research to the exposition and rendition of these studies.

Date: Thurs-Fri 7-8 July 2016 (8 sessions)

Venue: Woolley Common Room, Woolley Building, University of Sydney (open to public free of charge)
Situated in the broader genre of life-journey research, these *Deep Friendship* tributes are really character insights which enable the greater aspect of the person concerned to be considered in the more expansive dimension of their refined life-world context.

Among the particular studies of the *Deep Friendship* series I have contributed, are especially resonant character pieces devoted to exploring fervent advocacy qualities brought forward from substantial mutual experience I have shared with some familiar local conflict resolution exponents.

Notable among these would be the late dear Dr Stella Cornelius, with whom I shared much pertinent experience in this field of endeavour.

My tribute to Stella was evoked in the bounteous context of significant relative perspectives of how conflict resolution could be carried forward optimally from the personal aspect as a prevalent relevant concern.

Through the context of UNAA activism, for which Stella remained a stalwart benefactor and facilitator, and for CPACS, which she fostered through the establishment and inception of resource assistance, Stella shared various profound insights with me over the years on the dynamics of personal and collective mutual interaction.

Another more recent *Deep Friendship* study concerns Dr Keith Suter, with whom I worked assiduously over some years as our shared contribution to further establish the UNAA in NSW throughout the 1990s and even beyond, and through which many Association agency initiatives were implemented.

Moreover, these past couple of months, this time through the relevant interpretive context of the local Continental Philosophy Group forum, it has been such a delightful affirmative experience to rekindle vibrant insights derived from an extensive filmed interview with current CPACS Vice-President, Emeritus Professor Frank Stilwell.

This interview dialogue on the global economic trajectory since the Bretton Woods Conference was documented in 1994.

Given the tradition of such extensive dialogue sessions, carried out through the auspices of the UNAA (NSW), this was dubbed a *Deep Friendship Conversation* and recalibrated through the revelatory perspectives of a lucid contemporary work on this theme entitled *The Battle of Bretton Woods* by Benn Steil (Princeton University Press: 2014).

Meanwhile, most consistently and intensively throughout all those years of CPACS and UNAA (NSW) engagement and solidarity, probably the collaboration shared with Dr Anne Noonan, since about 1993, would be the most profound and special for me as a thoroughgoing mutual relational experience.

The *Deep Friendship* tribute I compiled for Anne appeared in July 2010.

Throughout, this work reverberates as a distinctive tribute to our many conversations and incisive perceptive forays into the realms of such interpretive processes as collective mutual maturity and paradox analysis.

These are situated as particular processes through which to respond to entrenched contradiction, and/or duality, which often tend to pervade the terrain of complex conflict.

However, what we tended to realise and affirm resolutely through such intricate explorative sojourns was the vital ample opportunity for imaginative endeavour in personal and collective resolution – what the likes of John Paul Lederach would deem to be ‘moral imagination’.

Effectively, *affirmative affinity* and *affection* were ever deemed vital as *pivotal connective elements* throughout this resonant process, especially in that such fervent facets of sensitive endeavour enabled the vibrant profound substance of mutual relations to be cultivated, and thereby to flourish.

Situated as a primary formative prospect, the abundant extent through which the phenomenon of *mutual affiliation* could proceed to manifest as a medium through which to consolidate such affinity and affection tended to be feasibly established in this context.

Consequently, the ultimate culminative element in this whole consolidatory process was for enough *affirmative appreciation* to be realised to enable these vital facets to sustain the continuity of vibrant mutual relations and experience, thereby to ensure the sustained efficacy of such an abundant essential process.
Given all these substantial process concerns, it would seem implicitly evident interpretively that each and every aspect of the UNAA (NSW) Community Project Deep Friendship intrinsic research tributes, together with the Dear Dalai Lama tributes, are pivotal affirmative celebratory works particularly pertinent to the action ‘purpose’ established in the CPACS Constitution to:

‘Facilitate dialogue between individuals and groups who are concerned with conditions of positive peace … in interpersonal relationships [my emphasis], community affairs, or within and between organisations and nations’ (C 2).

Each and every person and their positive distinctive ‘contributions’ remain the key elements through which ‘peace with justice’ can be cultivated and nourished within this basic context:

‘Peace with justice cannot be imposed from above, it can only be grown by inclusion and the acknowledgment of the contributions [my emphasis] from all different groups [and implicitly ‘individuals’] in society’ (Section C of the Preamble: Peace with Justice).

Thereby, the vital facet of mutuality comes into prominent perspective throughout all these contingencies as thorough appreciation of our universal mutual interdependence becomes feasible.

Moreover, the substantial benefit to be derived from active collaborative affiliation through such vibrant endeavour can enable the rich resonance of mutual experience to remain conducive to abundant collective affirmation and resolution.

Where all these supportive elements may be realised throughout the broad social, personal and cultural nexus of human endeavour, then a vital sense of finely attuned connective affinity, affection and mutual appreciation may be recognised as a pervasive beneficent outcome.

Lindsay Mell is a CPACS Council Executive Committee Member and a UNAA NSW Executive Committee Member

The UNAA Peace Program marked the day with a planting of an olive tree at Pymble Ladies’ College’s Sustainability Garden on Monday 21 March by Pymble Ladies’ College students, Ku-ring-gai Mayor Cheryl Szatow and UNAA Peace Program Director, Dr Zeny Edwards.

The United Nations International Day of Forests aims to raise awareness of the importance of forests and trees, including their role in climate change.

Last year the tree planting ceremony was held at the Ku-ring-gai Wildflower Garden, and Mayor Szatow said this year the focus was on educating the next generation on the value of the tree canopy.

“Prime Minister Turnbull has publicly stated the importance of preserving Sydney’s tree canopy and adding to it to help cool the city down,” she said.

“A ceremony such as this reminds us of the importance of trees in our local environment for the benefit of the wider community.”

“Sustainability is a focus we pursue with rigorous and disciplined intent at Pymble Ladies’ College,” said Principal Mrs Vicki Waters. “Our students and staff actively engage in sustainability management practices for the prosperity and longevity of our world. It is an honour for Pymble to support International Day of Forests with the planting of an olive tree in the College’s sustainability garden for current and future students and staff to enjoy.”

Dr Zeny Edwards from the United Nations Association and a life member of CPACs said the olive tree was ‘a powerful symbol of the life-giving properties of trees’.

“Olive trees provide food, oxygen, medicine and beauty. It is also the universal symbol of peace which is the perfect way of sending a message that a healthy planet is a peaceful planet.”
“Those who make peaceful revolution impossible will make violent revolution inevitable”. The words of President John F Kennedy, some eighteen months before his assassination, embody a key insight into social conflict that also appears, in slightly different words, in the famous preamble to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights: “It is essential, if man (sic) is not to be compelled to have recourse, as a last resort, to rebellion against tyranny and oppression, that human rights should be protected by the rule of law”.

At the very time in 1948 that the UDHR was being drafted, an historic act of lawlessness – the ethnic cleansing of Palestine, or al-Nakbah – was dispossessing a people whose rights have been systematically denied ever since and who have tried both violent and nonviolent means to restore them. In this book, Marwan Darweish and Andrew Rigby chronicle many years of Palestinian protests and delegations, and latterly armed struggle, nonviolent organising and popular resistance to Israel’s occupation of the West Bank and Gaza.

Some familiar patterns rapidly emerge. As early as the 1930s, as illegal Jewish immigration and land sales were already squeezing out the Arab peasantry, Palestinian complaints were conveyed to those responsible for the British Mandate, in London, in testimony to their faith in “persuasion and negotiation” (p 26). However, they failed to account for “the absolute commitment of the British to the Zionist project”, and suffered from a “severe imbalance of power”. The latter would often become evident as the visiting dignitaries were on their way back to Palestine, when “well-financed” pro-Israel lobbyists would set to work, so that by the time they returned home, any concession they had managed to obtain would have been reversed.

Later, as the 22% of the British Mandate territory set aside for them was itself occupied after 1967, the Palestinians engaged in armed struggle, in keeping with contemporary assumptions and images of the gun-toting rebel. When that proved unavailing, a rising generation in the West Bank and Gaza later set up their own parallel civil society, in the Intifada of the 1980s, attempting to disengage from the occupation of their lands and thereby bring it to an end.

The political energy of the Intifada combined with understandings between the Administration of George H.W. Bush and Arab allies in the campaign to oust Saddam Hussein from Kuwait, to pave the way for peace efforts brokered by the White House and then – starting with semi-official, so-called ‘track two’ contacts – in Oslo. Darweish and Rigby recall the “widespread euphoria” that met the Oslo Declaration, but remark that it was “tragically misplaced” (p 65).

Away from the cameras, Israeli governments continued their power plays to ensure any changes were purely symbolic. The result was “a cycle of violence fuelled on the Palestinian side by a growing sense of frustration at the lack of any substantive progress” (p 66). As we now know, the ‘Oslo years’ saw the biggest upsurge in the building of illegal Jewish settlements on occupied land. Peaceful revolution having been made impossible, it should have been no surprise when violent revolution came next.

The second Intifada, in the early 2000s, was entirely counter-productive from the Palestinians’ point of view, however. The shock and trauma produced by suicide bombings severely weakened the peace camp in Israeli society, which had been successfully engaged in the first Intifada a decade or more earlier. Civil-
ian involvement on the Palestinian side was, moreover, confined largely to “support roles” rather than “mass mobilisation” (p 69).

In 2002, the government of Ariel Sharon approved the plan for the separation wall that gobbled up still more Palestinian land, and by mid-2003, as I found on a visit to the West Bank, pollster Nabil Kukali, who had tracked the issue over many months, found the second Intifada had lost majority Palestinian public support.

On the same trip we filmed at the West Bank’s only zoo in the town of Qalqilya, one of many communities divided and reticulated by the wall and finding, in its now forlorn and deserted tourist attraction, a rich metaphor to convey the sense of imprisonment afflicting the human inhabitants. Demonstrations against the wall offered a renewed focus of popular resistance in the following decade, the authors observe, albeit one confined to a few dozen isolated pockets of protest.

The authors are unsparing in their forensic dissection of Palestinian failings, largely manifest in leadership divisions that have beset and hampered the cause for a century or more. A strong, united leadership is identified, in recent scholarship whose findings are summarised helpfully on pp 6-10, as one invariable characteristic of successful nonviolent popular uprisings. For such campaigns to succeed, the authors comment, “it is vital that conditions are created such that the target regime is forced to concede that the status quo is unsustainable” and that “an alternative future relationship between the parties becomes more attractive” (p 10).

Israeli peace groups that set out to promote this shift confront a wall of indifference, however. A notable strength of this book is the depth of fieldwork and the range of its informants. One of them, an Israeli activist, is quoted as saying: “The Israeli public has no interest in ending the occupation. It has no direct effect on their lives” (p 122).

When Israeli television news programmes do report on Palestinian protests, another said, viewers commonly “switch channels in order to avoid exposing themselves to such unwanted items” (p 149).

Where the authors locate a tentative source of hope for the future, therefore, is in the increasing engagement in the conflict by internationals, through various forms and means from humanitarian accompaniment, to organised tours and visits whose participants are then in position to bear first-hand witness testimony of conditions for the Palestinians under occupation, when they return home.

Centrepiece of these efforts is the campaign for Boycott, Divestment and Sanctions, adopted in response to a call from Palestinian civil society following an advisory ruling by the International Court of Justice, in 2004, on the illegality of Israel’s separation barrier, or ‘apartheid wall’. Efforts to prompt action by governments in response to this ruling were stymied, not least by the same well-financed pro-Israel lobbying action in world capitals that proved so effective decades earlier (noted above). Hence, the baton passed to global civil society to take up the call.

Worldwide solidarity actions create a context in which “the struggle is taking place at ideological, economic and diplomatic levels”, meaning that the ability of the Israeli army to “wield the weapons of violence with impunity, only serves to weaken its claim to legitimacy” (p 113).

Since the preparation of this manuscript (the book’s date of publication is given as 2015), news has kept arriving that suggests the potential of the BDS movement to bring the cost of occupation home to the Israeli public, and thereby cut through the indifference. Multinational companies, such as the giant global security firm, G4S; contracting company Veolia, and the soft drinks firm, Sodastream, have withdrawn from their investments in the Occupied Palestinian Territories. A report for the UN development agency, UNCTAD, found that foreign direct investment in Israel halved in 2014, as a horrified world watched the excesses of ‘Operation Protective Edge’, which killed 2,000 Gazan civilians.

Added to the gradual seepage of economic effects into everyday life for Israelis is the signal sent by cultural and academic boycotts, the latter having been endorsed by multiple scholarly associations in the United States of America, which benefits from First Amendment protections for freedom of expression. Elsewhere, pro-Israel lobbyists have not scrupled to invoke legal and other repressive measures in attempts to stifle BDS activism, as it proves increasingly persuasive and effective. UK Councils’ use of their purchasing power to boycott businesses implicated directly in the occupation was outlawed, with Westminster’s trademark contempt for local democracy. Perhaps the most significant development on the minus side, over recent months, has been the intensifying pressure to smear such activities as ‘anti-Semitic’.

Darweish and Rigby conclude by urging a renewed focus on fostering Palestinian unity, building on the achievement of the unified government forged between Fatah and Hamas. The book ends with the words of a veteran Palestinian activist, praising the younger generation of activists now emerging in the territories, who have “overcome the fear of the army and the settlers... Israel has not succeeded in suppressing the resistance” (p 179).

**CPACS Member in Action**

On 7 April 2016, CPACS Executive Committee Member and Visiting Scholar, Paul Duffill, published an article with The Sydney Morning Herald titled Australia guilty of double standards in supporting Israeli settlements: Australia’s support for Israel actions in the West Bank is increasingly out of step with its allies.

Paul emphasizes that “Australia’s political support for the settlements and continuing trade with Israeli arms companies that profit from the wall associated with the settlements is deeply problematic. It reveals a deep and dangerous double standard in how Australia responds to human rights abuses in one the world’s most volatile regions.”

For the full article, visit the website: [http://goo.gl/q6y8K3](http://goo.gl/q6y8K3)
2016 Sydney Peace Prize recipient Naomi Klein: “To Change Everything, We Need Everyone”
Lisa Fennis and Katie Gabriel

As Australia heats up, droughts, floods, storms and bush fires will become more frequent. Sea levels and temperatures are rising: the reef is bleaching to its bones. People living in Southwest Australia see their livelihoods dry up, whilst in the Solomon Islands entire populations are washed away from their coastal homes. Climate change is real and it is happening. Both people and nature, in Australia and elsewhere, are feeling its affects. If the earth warms up more than 2°C, we will set forces in motion we do not even properly comprehend yet. It’s an urgent threat and we are not acting fast enough.

These are the facts, plain and simple. And rather than convincing the few who choose not to heed the warnings of 95% of climate scientists worldwide, this year’s Sydney Peace Prize recipient compels us to act – together, now.

Naomi Klein receives the 2016 Sydney Peace Prize:

For exposing the structural causes and responsibility for the climate crisis, for inspiring us to stand up locally, nationally and internationally to promote a new agenda for sharing the planet, for encouraging innovation in thought and action that respects human rights and values, and for reminding us of the power of authentic democracy to achieve transformative change. (Sydney Peace Prize Jury)

These achievements motivated the Sydney Peace Prize Jury to select Naomi Klein from over 60 nominations submitted by people from Sydney, elsewhere in Australia and abroad.

While it might be tempting to make assumptions about the nature of Klein’s road from the suburbs of Montreal to paradigm shifting activist, journalist, and best-selling author, it is important to keep in mind that greatness comes through a lifetime of choices, of forks in the road where one can take the well-trodden path or choose the road less traveled – something all Sydney Peace Prize recipients embody. Born to activist parents who left the United States and migrated to Canada in protest of the Vietnam War, Klein was raised in a socially conscious environment. Yet Klein’s views on capitalism and the climate were not set from a prodigal age. As children do, Klein railed against her parents and what they stood for. Klein confesses that she spent her teens hanging out at the mall, obsessed with brands, to the point that she would stitch fake logos onto her clothing in an attempt to pass them off as high-end couture.

In 1989, when Klein was in University, fourteen women were tragically murdered in a shooting at the University of Montreal due only to their gender. The incident shocked Klein into rethinking her values. It proved to be a formative moment in her life which reshaped and crystallised her views on issues of social justice, gender and politics, and set her on the path to becoming a leading voice on issues of global social justice and social change. Later, when the climate shock of Hurricane Katrina intersected with neglect of public infrastructure and cruelty towards its African-Americans residents, Klein took on climate change. She warns that this “civilisational wakeup call” will affect all people regardless of race, class or religion, and as such demands that people forge alliances and work together to demand change and build a better system before it is too late. By focusing on Naomi Klein’s work and the issue of climate change, the Foundation hopes to bring to a larger audience the message that climate change is at the very heart issues of social justice and equality.

In the name of “progress”, to the edge of the climate cliff – how did we get here?

Naomi Klein excels at dissecting the systemic and fundamental challenges of our time. Throughout her career she has joined the dots between politics, economy and history, distilling powerful truths that are universally applicable, which once understood cannot be unheard or unseen. Turning to climate change in the book, film and worldwide campaign This Changes Everything, “Naomi Klein applies her fine, fierce and meticulous mind to the greatest, most urgent question of our time”, so

writes 2004 Sydney Peace Prize recipient Arundhati Roy.

Klein exposes the structural causes and responsibility for the climate crisis, and warns that it is more than an “issue” on a long shopping list of problems. Explaining how we ended up balancing on the edge of the climate cliff, she traces the thread back to centuries of resource extraction and carbon emissions, egged on by neoliberal market fundamentalism, unregulated capitalism and unfettered consumption. In the late 1980s, as it became apparent that the climate was in crisis, neoliberalism peaked – a case of monumental “bad timing”, according to Klein. As corporates are able to manipulate our governments, policy and media, democracy has started to resemble “corporatocracy”. People are supposed to believe that the markets will solve all our problems, from poverty and inequality to climate change. We are told that governments are here to assist: to liberate the power of capital, to privatize, to deregulate, to cut corporate taxes and slash public services. The faster the economy grows, the quicker we can save the world. This is precisely the danger, says Klein, as she issues a stern warning: the markets will not solve our problems. On the contrary, entrenched interests in hyper-profitability dominate the current system and obstruct any effort at a meaningful transformation. In this unrestrained capitalist system, power and wealth resides within a few percent of the world’s population – a group that is much more concerned with short-term economic interests and business as usual, than long-term...
sustainability and a healthy planet.

Klein calls it “a civilizational crisis, a narrative crisis”. Since the Industrial Revolution we have relentlessly extracted fossil fuels and pumped carbon into our atmosphere, congratulating ourselves that “we managed to master nature”. Our violent relationship with the planet is one based on an illusion that this is a one-way relationship, that we can keep taking without limit and never give back, that we can bend nature to our will. As nature’s response is approaching fast, we are slowly catching on. We have much to learn from the world’s indigenous populations. We must realise what our place is, not as masters of nature, but as a part of it.

So what about peace? What about justice?

Klein skilfully articulates how today’s economic system preserves devastating forms of structural violence. The economy is protected as the source of jobs and livelihood, and yet its predictable cycles of boom and bust perpetually punish the poorest and require the bailing out of those responsible. And it’s not just that. Klein also warns that as climate change will cause weather shocks, it will also cause budget shocks. In many countries the public sector, crippled by austerity, is ill-prepared and will not have the capacity to respond and support affected communities. After all, there are price tags attached to floods, fires, droughts and storms. New Orleans was a stark example.

As extreme weather events will cause resource scarcity, they will also intensify conflict and socio-economic inequalities. Between 2008 and 2014 alone, more than 150 million people were displaced as a result of climate change, moving within countries and across international borders. If we are horrified by reactions to the current waves of people seeking asylum in Australia and elsewhere, just imagine what this response would look like in the future, when weather patterns become increasingly erratic and patches of land become less and less inhabitable.

In a system that treats people as production units and where some are deemed more valuable than others, these are the values in which change will be dealt with. It is not difficult to imagine that the impacts of climate change will exacerbate existing tensions and injustices, such as inequality and racism. “Make no mistake about it,” Klein says, “it’s not just about things getting hotter and wetter, it’s about things getting a lot meaner.”

Leaping to new possibilities: from climate action to climate justice.

Not all of humanity is responsible for the current crisis. Only a small minority thinks about earth in terms of possession and mastery, rather than reverence, humility and stewardship. At the same time, many people who have had little or no part in extraction, emission or consumption, are now the first to be affected by the consequences.

Naomi Klein reminds us that change is not a trickle down process, but something that we, the people, must demand from our leaders. The clock is ticking and a powerful movement for such change is brewing, getting stronger by the day. People at the forefront of this movement are those who live off the land: indigenous peoples, farmers, and fishing communities. Witnessing and inspiring this movement, Klein is hopeful.

The movement is driven by a love of place, love of land, and a duty to protect future generations – a spirit of caring and compassion for country and each other. One that is not extractive. This movement is alive and kicking globally and in Australia. It is growing and gaining momentum. Lock the Gate and Save the Reef, which emerged from local communities, are two well-known campaigns with national support.

Klein puts forward climate change as the great unifier, an opportunity to right the wrongs that have been committed in the name of the economy. She inspires people power, and encourages everyone to stand up and work together to promote a new agenda for sharing the planet. Klein argues we must “change or be changed”: because science gives us a firm deadline, the climate crisis forces us to decide what kind of societies we want. Fixing climate change means changing how the economy works at its core, and there are many powerful movements across the world disillusioned with decades of neoliberal policies. Reigning in financial speculation, regulating money in politics, polluter-pays principles to redirect fossil fuel profits into green initiatives, and other policies that tackle climate change, such as keeping fossil fuels in the ground, locally-owned renewable energy grids, and public transport can bring about new jobs and infrastructure, and investment in neglected communities. This movement is not just about climate change, it is about climate justice and it is powerful.

“So we are left with a stark choice: allow climate disruption to change everything about our world, or change pretty much everything about our economy to avoid that fate. But we need to be very clear: because of our decades of collective denial, no gradual, incremental options are now available to us.

This is a civilizational wake-up call. A powerful message—spoken in the language of fires, floods, droughts, and extinctions—telling us that we need an entirely new economic model and a new way of sharing this planet.”

Klein rightly asks the tough questions and offers illuminating answers, warning us not to rely on the upper echelons of society to save us. There are no magical cures to the climate crisis, and the other 99% cannot afford to wait any longer for a saviour. She inspires the masses to take control of their own future and wellbeing, and also to care for our earth, our only lifeline. Climate change changes everything because we can no longer afford to put profits ahead of humanity, or fossil fuels ahead of survival.

The Sydney Peace Prize will be presented at the Sydney Town Hall on Friday 11 November where Naomi Klein will deliver the 2016 City of Sydney Peace Prize Lecture. This event will be followed by the Sydney Peace Prize Gala Dinner at the Hilton Sydney. Tickets to both events are available from Ticketbooth.com.au.

Lisa Fennis is the Director of the Sydney Peace Foundation

Katie Gabriel is the Executive Officer of the Sydney Peace Foundation
How Did We Get Here?
Megan Capriccio

How did we get here? More importantly, how do we fix it? It’s a set of questions I have been asking myself for some time now and the answer is anything but simple. As an American living in Sydney, I have had to endure much embarrassment and ridicule as I watch the 2016 U.S. president elections from afar. Although it has become interesting having a simultaneous inside and outside perspective on the continuous polarization of my country, I feel it would be an understatement to say that I am frustrated, frightened and even confused by what the elections have become. But because this election cycle has drawn attention from much of the world, especially Australia, I feel that the least I could do is offer one American’s opinion as to why U.S. politics is failing as well as potential solutions for hopeful change.

From my perspective, a big contribution to the chaos is due to U.S. political parties being transformed into identity traits. Not only does one’s political affiliation allude to which candidate you will be voting for, but also one’s party fully defines your views on all major debates: abortion, gay marriage, size of the government, trade, climate change and religious freedoms. Therefore, knowing someone’s party affiliation allows you to make an immediate and deep assumption of who someone is socially, politically and most of all morally. As a result, the American public has incurred stubbornness as a legitimate political tactic that rides so deep, no one is willing to even consider a compromise if it comes from the opposition. Whether these inferences of identity are true or not, is beside the point; the American people use this data to assess other Americans, and it ultimately effects how we interact and form relationships with fellow citizens.

These labels have contributed to Americans’ inability to work together for a greater good because their persistent disregard and disdain for the opposing party has become more of a priority than the betterment of the country. We are not united, even in times of national despair, and it is turning us into selfish individuals. Americans have forgotten that voting should be done in the best interests of the country but rather we have been conditioned to please our own personal interests in hopes that the majority of citizens will vote similarly. This is not to say that bias is easily triumphed, but as a country we have become so individualistic that we have forgotten what it could be like to work as a unified entity. This becomes incredibly clear during election seasons.

Although each U.S. national needs to do his or her civic duty to participate, the U.S. cannot escape this equilibrium if citizens do not have a leader who embodies this initiative. In my opinion, none of the current candidates has been able to unite the American people as a unified group, unless it is to tune into a news scandal that has objectified or marginalized a particular group in the process. Therefore, U.S. nationals need to take careful consideration with their voting to ensure they are moving towards building up the American community and moving the country away from extreme polarization.

The country is at the stage where the American public needs a leader that can offer genuine assurance and security to the entirety of the American population in order to re-establish trust among Americans as well as members of the wider international community. The natural reaction to avoid Trump’s outlandish claims that demonize much of the population is to counteract by voting Sanders. However, I cannot say that this is contributing to a solution. Although Sanders is appealing, his tactics of blaming a particular identity group don’t vary much from Trump. The only variation is that Sanders has simply chosen to blame a group that holds substantial power and wealth making it appear worthy of scrutiny. These two candidates continue to swing the political party pendulum that results in reinstating the process of polarization. Clinton seems the likely candidate to steer the country towards compromise, but her overestimation of the country’s ability to reach an understanding may cause her to simply concede her own values.

Although it seems like the options are limited, Americans could make substantial gains if they strive to expect more from the 2016 presidential candidates. We need to demand action plans, not just hearsay. We need to demand professionalism as candidates are representing all Americans in the global plenary. And lastly, we need to demand an end to extremism, as it is deteriorating American leadership and the function of the democratic process. Although apathy is easy, as political participation is not mandatory in the U.S., Americans can make these demands and a broader impact simply by placing a well-calculated vote.

The current political habits may take years to dismantle and unlearn, but it is necessary if the U.S. is ever going to feel a sense of peace and unity within government and political systems. Even though it is difficult to know how the U.S. got to this stage, it’s up to the American people to insist on a change.

Illustration by Tom Sloan
The Silk Roads: A New History of the World by Peter Frankopan
A Review by Mujib Abid

As the political grip of the West slowly diminishes in the rest of the world, epistemological shifts in our understanding of history seems to be inevitable. In *The Silk Roads*, Peter Frankopan, Senior Research Fellow at Worcester College and Director of the Centre for Byzantine Research at Oxford University, attempts to reshape our historical discourses by producing a world history from the prism of the East. It is an ambitious project with an incomparable sense of depth, scope, and range that challenges the Eurocentrism of mainstream history and strives to introduce a more balanced view of the past.

In *The Silk Roads*, Frankopan contextualises and grounds historical enquiry by delving into a world that is centred not in Europe or the West; rather, the ‘centre’ of progress and technological advances, and of the world for that matter, is in Persia. Going back to the 6th century B.C., ‘the Persians came to dominate their neighbours, reaching the shores of the Aegean, conquering Egypt and expanding eastwards as far as the Himalayas.’ Frankopan illustrates a vivid picture of the ancient silk trade routes, illustrating the treacherous Pamir Mountains, the fabled Chinese silk which inspired the route’s name, and the doomed Buddhas of Bamiyan.

Revelations about the Muslim world and its fabled empires pose questions for the acknowledgment and further recognition of the relatively well known and the forgotten alike. Frankopan talks of Abu Rayhan al-Biruni, the man who theorised that earth revolved around the sun and rotated on an axis, and Abu Ali Husayn ibn Sina, or as known in the West Avicenna, whose unparalleled work on logic, theology, medicine and philosophy he described as ‘awe-inspiring’. Revealing tales like how Caliph Abd al Malik, the ninth caliph of Islam, had minted his coins with Prophet Muhammad’s depiction should serve as important historical reference points when engagement with or refuting dogmatic interpretations of Islam.

Equally fascinating chapters, filled with surprises, rich descriptions, and unexpected turns follow. The Fourth Crusade turned against their fellow Christian brethren when they pillaged Zara and Constantinople, and its knights and crusaders all turned into soldiers of fortune fighting for the highest bidder. The hope for a supposed David, king of two Indies, who was going to ‘devour the sacrilegious Saracens like beasts’ turned out to be the Mongols who did not distinguish between the Sarecans or Christians. Frankopan makes a compelling case for viewing Mongols in a different light, for their bureaucracy and worldview is not that of ‘savages’ leading hords. William Knox D’Arcy, the English aristocrat, whose success in Australia helped him secure an oil concession with Mozaffar al-Din Shah Qajar of Persia ended up causing much of Iran instability in the 20th century. The Iran-gate –leaks that exposed American support for Iran against Iraq – led to a siege mentality in Saddam’s Iraq that fuelled his antagonism towards the US.

The titular silk roads is used as a continuum; the ancient trade route that traversed through the ‘Eastern’ regions, connecting China to Persia, Mesopotamia, Byzantine, and the shores of Europe in the Mediterranean. Cities like Samarkand, presently a bustling tourist city in Uzbekistan and Bamyan, in the central plains of Afghanistan, were among its most important trading posts. The Silk Road was a medium for the spread of people, ideas, technology, religions, armies, disease and of course trade.

Nicknamed One Belt, One Road, China is planning on revamping the ancient trade route through the Silk Road Economic Belt and The 21st Century Maritime Silk Road. It is an ambitious vision that would involve two-third of the world’s population in 60 nations. Frankopan’s *The Silk Roads* is a reaffirmation of why the ‘rise’ of the East is not only inevitable but already underway. A transformed epistemological framework in writing history and evaluating the past goes hand in hand with this shift in the global balance of power.

Mujib Abid is a PhD student at the University of Sydney’s Department of Government and International Relations. He holds a Master of Peace and Conflict Studies degree from the Centre for Peace and Conflict Studies.

**West Papua Project**

The conflict in West Papua remains a core priority issue for leading regional organisations and has caused a shift in the regional architecture of the Pacific region as Indonesia seeks to engage with individual states to undermine and counter Papuan diplomacy. The West Papua Project has been involved in this process by acting as bulwark underpinning claims of Indonesian abuses made by the Papuans; by providing academic and strategic space for discussion between the many actors involved, and by providing support and advice to Papuan leaders in their efforts to firstly achieve unity and secondly gain regional and international support in their quest for self-determination.

This theme along with the effects of climate change in West Papua will be examined at a forum later this year which aims to examine the massive environmental havoc being wrought as millions of hectares of rainforests are being cleared for the Merauke Integrated Food and Energy Estate.

For more information, visit: [http://goo.gl/5GOZ0x](http://goo.gl/5GOZ0x)
The Refugee Language Program started 2016 with an enrolment day and lunch in the Education Building. A number of students who were enrolled in the 2015 classes returned to continue their study and were joined by a large group of new students from Syria, Iraq, Iran, Burma, Afghanistan, Sri Lanka and other nations.

We offer two ESL classes and a Conversation and Technology class on Saturdays as well as a Wednesday, one-to-one tutoring group where volunteer tutors come in to the Mackie Building to teach a refugee. Resources and worksheets of appropriate material is made available, as well as materials in an RLP drop-box. Some of the tutors, with teaching background, also bring their own resources, and encourage students to direct their own learning.

On Mondays, a group of 10-15 refugees (referred by the RLP) also meet in the Law Building for individual tutoring. This project is organized by two students in the Sydney University Law Society (SULS), Ellen and Katie, and will continue for the whole year with a short break during exam periods. The refugees love being involved with these young, compassionate tutors who are striving to make a difference in an increasingly callous political environment. As with all our volunteers, the tutors are also enriched by this experience. They get the opportunity to meet people from all over the world with stories of courage, perseverance and gratitude, as well as developing their tutoring and communication skills.

The RLP also helps students realise their personal or career goals. A student from Sri Lanka, for example, gained his Fork Lift Driving Certificate; an athlete from Kyrgyzstan was tutored for several months by Oliver (Ombudsman’s Office) to gain her soccer referee’s license; a Research Fellow in the School of Medicine, Leticia, tutors a doctor from Burundi for his Australian Medical Council Exams. Another volunteer, Chris, has spent many hours contacting organizations to find a free course for refugees who want to start a small business, and on Wednesday after class, Martin and Aleks shared a meal in a Korean restaurant with a student from Afghanistan.

The RLP also provides an enriching experience to Japanese students from Chuo University who visit us annually to participate in one of our Saturday classes, share lunch and meet and talk to our refugees. We all enjoyed the visit in March, this year, and a number of the Japanese students were added to the RLP Facebook page. We also regularly receive enquiries about our program from local and overseas sources. One such this year came from Dublin, Ireland:

"The aim of the thesis is to recommend a Social Innovation to the ***** Business School that may entice them to get involved in the world migrant crisis from an Irish perspective. The goals of this proposed innovation are similar to that of your Refugee Language Program and so I would like to benchmark some ideas against those of your program.”

Despite the positive beginning to the year, the RLP is in danger of being dismantled through lack of funding. This would mean that the hard work of all the volunteers that have helped set up a professional and welcoming program for asylum seekers would no longer exist. Our program is unique and the loss to the refugee community would be significant.

Some good news for us though, is a crowd-funding project run by the Sydney Student and Alumni Association. They are producing a video, which if successful, will make a huge difference. Krishna and Orion, Executive Committee members have visited the classes and filmed the different groups and classes of the RLP. Anna Breckon, a filmmaker and former RLP Creative Writing teacher from the Department of English, is making the video. We hope to upload the video onto the University of Sydney website in May and we encourage you to share the link with family, friends and colleagues.

The RLP is rich in personnel, expertise, goodwill and compassion but without adequate funding we have no future. The majority of volunteers with the RLP are staff, students or alumni of Sydney University who would welcome a renewal of financial support from the Office of the Vice-Chancellor.

Lesley Carnus is the Co-ordinator for the Refugee Language Program.

Leo, Lema and Chuo University students from Japan enjoying lunch between RLP lessons. Photo Credit: Lesley Carnus
Active Learning, Regional Relations and Human Rights
Lynda-ann Blanchard and Michael Nix

Paraphrasing Japanese peace educator Tsunetaburo Makiguchi, “value-creating” education involves the happiness of learners. Precisely this tenet underpinned the 2016 regional human rights education initiative—coordinated by colleagues from Chuo University’s Law Faculty (Japan) and the University of New South Wales Faculty of Law along with University of Sydney’s Centre for Peace and Conflict Studies (Australia)—entitled “Investigating Diversity, Human Rights and Civil Society in Japan and Australia”.

Yet, learning about human rights and peace with justice is also deeply challenging and requires stamina. Invariably, the complexity of human rights issues manifests in diverse contexts. For example, non-government and community organisations we visited for the first time this year included: Immigrant Women’s Health Services; NSW Federation of Community Language Schools as well as a Vietnamese community language school in a temple; Multicultural Community Services and Ashfield Council to talk about their services for migrants: Anti-Slavery Australia and Migrante, two organisations that provide legal support for exploited migrant workers; the Gender Center which provides information on transgender issues; Twenty10, a support organisation for LGBTIQ youth; and, Acceptance and Met-

oral Community Church, two groups which welcome and support LGBTIQ workers; the Gender Center which provides legal support for exploited migrant workers; the Gender Center which provides information on transgender issues; Twenty10, a support organisation for LGBTIQ youth; and, Acceptance and Metropolitan Community Church, two groups which welcome and support LGBTIQ Christians.

As commented by Chuo University’s project coordinator Prof. Michael Nix, “the programme is designed [to create] a praxis for learning about and building peace with justice based on principles of agency, engagement and dialogue”.

Now in its third year, the programme stems from a successful Australia-Japan Foundation (DFAT) grant that provided seed funding for a pilot project in 2014 engaging CPACS PhD students as research mentors to Chuo Law Faculty students. The aim of this academic and cultural exchange is to highlight an approach to human rights education that values student-centred learning and relationship building between academic institutions, civil society organisations and community groups.

This year, nine research students from Chuo University visited Sydney for seventeen days in February and March. The students engaged in talks/workshops, group visits and individual/pair fieldwork trips. Participation by four CPACS guest lecturers featured—Leah Lui-Chivizhe’s workshop on Torres Strait Islander turtle masks; Lyn Riley’s Aboriginal Kinship Workshop; Ben Oh’s LGBTIQ rights workshop; and, former Australian Human Rights Commissioner Sev’s Ozbowsk’s Q&A on human rights, diversity and multiculturalism.

Overall, the programme this year was a success because we could build on relationships established in the two previous years and learn from reflective feedback and suggestions. We were happy to make return visits to many of the same organisations and people as last year or the year before, such as: the Refugee Art Project and Refugee Language Programme the Safe School’s Coalition, Domestic Violence NSW, and Muslim Women’s Association; as well as Australian Red Cross, House of Welcome, Auburn Centre for Community, and Settlement Services International. We also visited the Blue Mountains and the Refugee Support Group there again; returned to La Perouse after a year away, and visited the entrepre-neurial Aboriginal Black Market for the first time; joined the Tribal Warrior Cruise as in past years, as well as this year for the first time joining in the “boxing mentoring youth project” at Tribal Warrior Corporation from 6am one morning; and, enjoyed the Mardi Gras festival once more on our last night.

In all, the programme this year included four talks/workshops, 17 group visits and activities, and 23 individual/pair/small group fieldwork activities! Plus students engaged in their own cultural activities, going to Manly Beach, Bondi Beach, Tar-ranga Zoo and, the Queen Victoria Building and Sydney Town Hall. The students also arranged a trip to see an opera, The Barber of Seville, at the Sydney Opera House and we were able to see a performance by Bangarra, the internationally renowned Indigenous dance group.

A significant change was that our main university partner this year in Sydney was the University of New South Wales (UNSW) Faculty of Law where we were based for four days (for fieldwork planning and preparing and giving the final poster presentations). We also kept CPACS as a partner and made several visits there for workshops and talks. Spending time at two universities worked well and we’d like to continue to build relationships with more universities in the future.

One other major difference this year was that all the students stayed together at the

(Continued on page 23)
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Central Youth Hostel in Sydney (close to Central Station). Although that was nowhere near as luxurious as the home stays last year (or the hotel the first year), the location was useful for fieldwork visits and we were able to catch up with homestay hosts from last year—CPACS members Jane Fulton, Marty Morison and Ben Oh. This included a very kind invitation to Jane’s home for Japanese colleagues to enjoy a Welcome BBQ-Pool party. Distinctly Australian and not Japanese!

Importantly, we're starting to establish ongoing programme relationships in Sydney. People who remember the programme, ask about individual students from last year and from the pilot group. Two students Asuka, Lisa and Saeko, one of the co-ordinators from Chuo, were recorded in a local news report on the Internet this year, about an activity they attended being run by the refugee support organization House of Welcome. Furthermore, when we were welcomed by organizers at a meeting about LGBTIQ refugees, we got a special cheer! The significance of the student-led nature of research projects investigating human rights in Japan and Australia becomes clear with such engagement. Borrowing from Makaguchi again, “The essence of education is not to transfer knowledge; it is to guide the learning process, to put responsibility for study in the student's own hands... [and] place people on their own path of discovery and invention.”

Building on students’ contributions over the past three years, we envisage continuing to develop this annual human rights education initiative, not just as a terrific research and learning experience for students, but as a chance to exchange information with activists, academics and professionals in Japan and Australia. Thus, this pedagogy embeds a process of creating ongoing relationships with people and organizations—across cultures and countries—concerned with human rights, peace and justice.

Refugee Language Program

Background:
The Refugee Language Program was created in 2004 as the result of an initiative by Fellows of the University Senate and was set up with university funding to offer free language tuition to refugees. Classes in intermediate and advanced level English are held on campus during the week and on Saturday mornings. All the teachers are volunteers from university academic staff, student or alumni with the skills appropriate to the Teaching of English as a Second Language. We have also trained staff members and students as Mentors to meet refugees on a one to one basis to help them with their English study.

Many of our refugee students are ineligible to attend Government sponsored English classes. Many of our students suffer from economic and social deprivation or have suffered torture and trauma in their countries of origin. Our program helps, in some measure, to alleviate the dislocation and isolation that these people suffer, as well as providing language skill classes at no cost.

Eligibility:
Asylum Seekers holding Temporary Protection Visas, those on Bridging E Visas as well as Community Detention Visas are all eligible to enrol. If students are unsure about the location of the university we send maps and directions on how to get here. All forms are available on our web-page.

Funding:
From 2005 to 2013 the program has been part of the Centre for Peace and Conflict Studies, where we have an office and other facilities. The University has contributed to the running of the program and in 2013 the Pratt Foundation made a generous grant to the university which has enabled the RLP to continue our teaching service. The program now depends on private donations and grants to fund our work with refugees and asylum seekers.

The RLP also uses these funds to cover additional running costs; light lunches for the volunteers and students, fares, excursions, resources and materials and sundry expenses.

In 2016 we would also like to raise enough money to publish another small anthology of students’ creative writing.

If you are interested in supporting this program, please visit our website for more information: http://goo.gl/YGZLRJ

Dr Lynda-Ann Blanchard, CPACS Honorary Associate and Vice-President, Australian Council for Human Rights Education Professor. Michael Nix, Law School Chuo University, Japan.

Conversations with Japanese students and refugees between RLP lessons
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Convenient Caricatures: Mossack-Fonseca and the Corporate Colonial Mentality

Robert Austin

From the moment the US-based International Consortium of Investigative Journalists (ICIJ) released the so-called “Panama Papers” in early April 2016, the global corporate and state-owned media have gone into overdrive to portray them as somehow reflective of an entire nation’s integrity. One key effect has been to deflect attention from other, much bigger fiscal havens like the United States itself (godfather among them), Switzerland, the British Virgin Islands and a series of surrogate western-driven billionaire financial escapes. Let us place this scandal in historical perspective and consider the ICIJ project’s means and ends.

Panama, in common with Spanish-speaking Latin America and the Caribbean, spent 300 years under the genocidal domination of the Spanish aristocracy. Note the political implications of describing it thus, rather than “under Spanish domination”, which homogenises the long-suffering peninsular peasantry, its incipient urban working class, their brutal feudal aristocracies and colonial occupying forces (initially under mercenary Columbus), as if all shared equal responsibility for the imperial project of subordinating an entire continent by military and religious colonisation. By the mid-1500s, the occupying empire was already thinking of accelerating the region’s profitability by slicing the isthmus in two via a canal, to increase profits on Pacific-Atlantic trade.

Between 1880 and 1914, with the region firmly under US imperial dominance, a private French-US consortium initiated by Ferdinand de Lesseps but ultimately dominated by US banker JP Morgan oversaw construction of the Panama Canal, with the acquiescence of pliant regimes in Colombia and Panama, both bereft of labour laws. Worker deaths during the canal’s construction top the list of most deadly building projects in the last two centuries: 408.12 deaths per 1,000 workers and a total of 30,609, some 500 deaths per mile. Most were black Caribbean descendants. A puppet regime ceded the Canal Zone to the US in perpetuity. The Suez Canal, whose construction de Lesseps’s firm also oversaw in the 1880s, stands at sixth worst, with 120,000 deaths among 1.5 million workers, also the worst construction-worker death toll of any canal project in the last two centuries.

In the immediate wake of the US-dominated post-war reconstruction conference at Yalta, the US armed forces Southern Command established the School of the Americas (SOA) in the Panama Canal Zone, against popular will but again with support from a pro-US regime, representing only the neo-colonial beneficiaries among the local elite. The SOA rapidly earned the nickname “School of Assassins”. Every post-war dictator from Latin America has trained there, alongside numerous heads of death squads and 64,000 soldiers from the region, most of whom returned home to wage war on their own populations under military dictatorship, in the name of Washington’s National Security doctrine. Panamanian president Dr Jorge Ilueca—a former president of the UN General Assembly—closed the SOA to popular acclaim in 1984, calling it “the biggest base for destabilization in Latin America.”

The Mossack-Fonseca Papers

Distinguished Panamanian International Relations scholar, Julio Yao, has highlighted historic comparisons to address the issue of means and ends in this case. When Daniel Ellsberg leaked a small part of a 7,000-document Defence Department report to the New York Times in 1971, revealing presidential lying to Congress in the interests of the military-industrial complex prolonging the Vietnam War, the Times baptised them The Pentagon Papers. That is, not “The US Papers”. When journalists Woodward and Bernstein exposed infamous president “Tricky Dicky” Nixon as instigator of an illegal break-in to rival Democratic Party headquarters, corporate media dubbed their expose the “Watergate Scandal”, not the “US Scandal”. No arm of government punished the leakers (today’s hackers), who won popular global acclaim. The singular contemporary exception to this obscuring of national origins was Philip Agee’s pioneering expose on US state-sponsored terrorism in Latin America, the CIA Diary, in 1975. Unlike his contemporaries’ celebrity status, both the US and UK military-industrial complexes and their political allies secured Agee’s lifelong exile. Only after a similar fate in three other countries and near starvation did Cuba eventually give him asylum.

When in 2010 Julian Assange released thousands of US government diplomatic cables on the empire’s global torture, espionage and military intervention networks, they entered newspeak as Wikileaks, with no titular reference to their national origins. Enter Edward Snowden in 2013: his enhancement of Wikileaks insights via a massive public dump of incriminating material from the CIA and NSA, then from the UK’s spy agency GCHQ, was dubbed with variants of the “secret global surveillance network” by mainstream media, amidst political establishment hysteria demanding recriminations like those against Assange, realised or planned. Again there were no dubbing pros for public memory to systematically link Snowden’s expose to the belligerent Western powers whose geopolitical projects such agencies serve. They appear not as a Washington-driven hierarchy but simply as global operations without national headquarters.

Unlike these examples, however, the entity under scrutiny in the Mossack-Fonseca case is not even an arm of government. It is a private law firm in only the thirteenth most lucrative tax haven for billionaires, notoriously concentrated in the advanced capitalist world (known by another misnomer, the First World) and not from the vast majority of the world’s population which it exploits, and to which it gave the hierarchical misnomer of the Third World. A quick count of the number of Nobel laureates for literature in that world, portrayed in the dominant occidental paradigm as culturally backward, abruptly inverts the prism. Pointedly the Latin American multistate broadcaster Telesur uses the slogan “Our North is the South”.


The same global corporate media which stands between real history and the common reader on a daily basis has now nationalised the private law firm Mossack-Fonseca’s scandal. Not only is this a reflection of News Corp and allies’ permanent advocacy for socialisation of private debt and privatisation of public assets. Professor Yao has described the process of transference of guilt-by-association to the entire population of the country as expressing the persistence of a colonial mentality. Alternative media like Green Left Weekly and Red Flag have uncritically adopted the same terminology. Dorfman and Mattelart’s iconic How to Read Donald Duck (1971) is among better-known studies on that mentality in the post-war era. But as Duck exposed the integration of cultural and economic imperialism, so Yao has shown the US plutocracy’s self-serving manipulation of both the facts and potential of the Mossack-Fonseca Scandal.

The US Government, he notes, “has acknowledged funding the filtration of the 11.5 million Mossack-Fonseca Papers, and handing them over to the German newspaper Sueddeutsche Zeitung.” From there, he suggests, they landed at the ICIJ, which is supported by multi-billionaire George Soros plus Rockefeller and Ford (foundations), both notorious conduits for US economic and geopolitical interests. “Curiously”, he concludes, they have not exposed the US elite “who happily surf in the offshore Mossack-Fonseca”, but instead have selectively exposed “some tricky characters from the emerging BRICS countries (Brazil, Russia, India, China and South Africa)”, as if these too were congenial with their national populations. (Coincidentally, the BRICS block has emerged as the principal rival to global US economic hegemony.) Describing the ICIJ’s means as conspiratorial, Yao concludes that the principal Western regimes involved, the United States and United Kingdom, want to contaminate the Panamanian economy, “to provoke a global stam pede into the tax havens of the US, Britain, Holland and Israel, more ‘reliable’ than Panamanian ones.”

Bloomberg Businessweek forecast precisely this scenario in January 2016, arguing that the US has become the world economic elite’s preferred tax haven. It notes that European-based global gurus on billionnaire tax avoidance schemes like Rothschild have recently opened trust companies in the US, transferring funds out of hitherto-untouchable haunts like Switzerland and The Bahamas. One Rothschild seminar last year on tax avoidance for the world’s richest, entitled “Using U.S. Trusts in International Planning: 10 Amazing Feats to Impress Clients and Colleagues,” set out legal ways “to avoid both U.S. taxes and disclosures to clients’ home countries.” The incremental attraction of the USA as a fiscal haven—precisely the kind which encourages sudden capital flight from peripheral economies like Panama’s at the hint of higher profits elsewhere—derives from the Obama regime’s refusal to sign on to new international reporting standards on taxation adopted by the OECD, despite having instigated them. Such unique deception by Washington parallels US endorsement of the UN’s International Court of Justice in The Hague, but refusal to have its own citizens subject to its jurisdiction. Indeed the OECD lists 96 countries having endorsed the new standards and four as having “not indicated a timeline” or “not yet committed” (Bahrain, Nauru, Vanuatu and notably Panama). Only the US regime rejects them outright.

The potential economic fallout of the Mossack-Fonseca Papers for Panama, already burdened with massive World Bank austerity debt and empire-imposed underdevelopment, are considerable—as a strategically-placed financial and trade centre, with a duty-free zone and profitable canal—and capable of bankrupting the country. In the broader context of US hegemony over the region—integrated with a series of other imperial interests by Israel, Spain, China, the UK and Australia—the global corporate interests served by Mossack-Fonseca are entirely at odds with Panamanian sovereign interests. Popular anticolonial struggle re- viled the SOA from the outset and eventually threw it out, has steadily overcome the effects of a US invasion in 1989 (when Panamanian dictator and CIA agent Manuel Noriega, showing an independent streak, suddenly became a target for “regime change”), and in 2010 impelled Panama into the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States, the great majority expression of the region’s 600 million inhabitants for true independence. Panama’s small neo-colonial bourgeoisie is the only national fraction positioned to benefit from any economic fallout from the Mossack-Fonseca Papers, though it is subservient to the late capitalist economies which stand as their principal global beneficiaries. The ultimate and only project which would benefit the vast bulk of humanity—eradicating not only fiscal havens, but the barbarous and planet-destroying system which spurns them—is neither on the horizon of the global profitiers nor the ICIJ. Others will need to carry out that project.

Dr Robert Austin is a Visiting Scholar at CPACS, University of Sydney

Robert Austin’s edited collection Imperialismo Cultural en América Latina (2007) analyses how an occidental culture compatible only with imperial geopolitical and economic interests has been hegemonised across Latin America and the Caribbean, though always contested by autochthonous cultures.

A revised edition has been published as an open-access e-book at http://goo.gl/thfNGY. Google analytics shows that the host site has 25,000 readers daily.

Professor Mônica Dias Martins (UEC, Fortaleza, Brazil) notes that the book “presents important reflections on the resistance to imperialism”. Professor Peter McLaren (UCLA, USA) regards it as “a major contribution to the contemporary debates about cultural imperialism ... destined to make a major impact in the field of Latin American Studies.”

To view the full review, visit the following website: http://goo.gl/2KvWcW
In Memoriam

On 24 March 2016 CPACS lost a talented graduate who lived life to the full, from his days as a wartime photojournalist in Afghanistan and various countries in Africa to his latest passion and focus on addressing the global challenges of climate change. Sean Hobbs died unexpectedly not long after he and his wife, Stephanie, and two young daughters, Amalia and Ines, returned to live in Sydney having spent almost six years overseas working in Fiji and Sweden.

Sean grew up in Sydney and completed a Bachelor of Fine Arts with UNSW and studied journalism at UTS. He went along one day to volunteer at Oxfam where he met and wooed his wife to be, Stephanie Chiu. Sean was reportedly impressed to find a young woman who was planning to go to work in Afghanistan, especially at that time. Sean himself was contracted as Official War Photographer for the Australian War Memorial in 2007 and became the first embedded war journalist in Afghanistan, as well as being deployed to a number of other countries in the Middle East. In 2008, Sean’s war photography was recognised by the Leica People’s Choice Award from the Centre for Contemporary Photography for his series ‘The Horror of War’ chronicling the experiences of people affected by the Lord’s Resistance Army insurgency in Northern Uganda.

After Steph returned from Afghanistan she came to study at CPACS in 2005, starting with a Graduate Certificate and eventually upgrading and completing a Master of Letters degree – but not without some stops and starts along the way – including working as a restorative justice practitioner and giving birth to their first child, Amalia, in 2008. Also along the way, Sean decided to follow his wife to study at CPACS. Sean graduated with a Master of Peace and Conflict Studies with Merit in 2011, having excelled in his studies including units on Conflict-Resolving Media; Human Rights, Peace and Justice; Nonviolence and Social Change; United Nations, Peace and Security; and Ethics, Law and War.

In the meantime, both Steph and Sean had moved to Fiji with baby Amalia in tow for the next stage in Sean’s career. Sean worked for two years as a Publications and Communications Coordinator with the Pacific Regional Rights Resources Team, in the Human Rights Legal Advocacy division of the Secretariat of the Pacific Community. During that time baby Ines was born. Sean emailed me from Fiji in December 2011 saying he was working on Drafting Options for Legislative Reform projects in relation to violence against women and the implementation of CEDAW for five Pacific countries.

In 2014 Sean moved into a new job as Community Communications and Information Officer, again for the Secretariat of the Pacific Community, where his work involved the impact of climate change in the Pacific. This led to a position as Digital Communications Officer with the Stockholm Environment Institute in Sweden, where he thrived in his new work community and as a father introducing his daughters to the totally new environment of snow and ice after spending their first few years in hot and sunny Fiji.

In his 38 years, Sean’s enthusiasm for life and compassion for others touched many people, from those he met and photographed in Northern Uganda and other war-torn countries, to his family and friends in Sydney and the colleagues and friends he lived and worked with in Fiji and Sweden. The many tributes at his memorial service at Hunters Hill Sailing Club on 13 April were heartfelt and inspiring, celebrating a man whose life clearly made a difference in building a more caring and peaceful world. A quotation which inspired Sean and was included at the memorial sums up his attitude to life: ‘risking all to be oneself’.

Dr Wendy Lambourne taught both Sean and Steph at CPACS, and was Steph’s MLitt treatise supervisor. Steph also worked with CPACS subsequently as a guest lecturer and facilitator. If you want to be in touch or send any messages to Sean’s family or friends, please contact Wendy on wendy.lambourne@sydney.edu.au.
For the last five years I have travelled to The Hague to visit my son who works for the U.N. Last year I thought I’d walk to the Vredespaleis, (www.vredespaleis.nl) and use this wonderful space to write. I’d like to share the first poem of the series, Peace Palace, with you.

The formal gardens through the windows, designed to appease the agitated spirit, seem colourless in this land of floral magnitude. I wait for inspiration but can’t escape my own barbed-wire tangle of anxieties. The room is silent except for the violet-voiced librarian at the front desk. My rose-covered journal seems insubstantial amongst desktops, laptops, ipads and silver reading lamps. I hold my ground and persevere, re-read the rules and note that my water is not permitted nor the bon-bon which I pop into my mouth. Relieved to have made it past identity checks, security searches and frantically revolving doors, I’ve come to write in harmonious surround but all I am swayed to do is stare through the windows and wonder where to begin.

Vredespaleis-den Haag
Lesley Carnus

The formal gardens through the windows, designed to appease the agitated spirit, seem colourless in this land of floral magnitude. I wait for inspiration but can’t escape my own barbed-wire tangle of anxieties. The room is silent except for the violet-voiced librarian at the front desk. My rose-covered journal seems insubstantial amongst desktops, laptops, ipads and silver reading lamps. I hold my ground and persevere, re-read the rules and note that my water is not permitted nor the bon-bon which I pop into my mouth. Relieved to have made it past identity checks, security searches and frantically revolving doors, I’ve come to write in harmonious surround but all I am swayed to do is stare through the windows and wonder where to begin.
Study at the Centre for Peace and Conflict Studies

The Peace and Conflict Studies coursework program helps students to understand the causes of conflict and violence and the means of attaining peace, justice and human rights on a local and global scale. At postgraduate level you can choose to complete a Graduate Certificate, Graduate Diploma or Master of Peace and Conflict Studies.

Informed by the latest research, the postgraduate coursework program focuses on developing theoretical understanding and practical skills that you can apply to an increasingly diverse field of peace and conflict studies. Theoretical underpinnings for the program are covered in the core units: Key Issues in Peace and Conflict Studies; Human Rights, Peace and Justice; Peace of Mind: Psychology of Peace; and Reconciliation and Conflict Transformation; and the capstone unit, Conflict Resolution: Theory and Practice. These core and capstone units provide students with a fundamental body of knowledge and skills in peace and conflict studies.

The program also offers a variety of core electives in which you can study: the United Nations, its history and the challenges it faces in maintaining international peace and security; how the media can contribute to peace; the philosophy and practice of nonviolence as a means of promoting social change; how to resolve conflict in organisations; and the practice of conflict-sensitive development and peace building. Online core electives engage students in the relationship between democratisation and development, and how the world’s finite food resources can be distributed more justly and sustainably.

The unique value-explicit, transdisciplinary approach of the Peace and Conflict Studies program equips you to think critically and contribute meaningfully to local and international peacebuilding and conflict resolution, humanitarian aid and development, human rights and social justice.

Flexible learning plans mean that it is possible to study full time or part time for your degree, as classes are offered in the daytime and evenings as well as online. We offer many units in intensive mode during semester and as part of Sydney Summer School and Winter School. You can also customise your degree, complementing the core academic program in Peace and Conflict Studies with a selection of units available through other departments and postgraduate programs at the University of Sydney, particularly the School of Social and Political Sciences, in which the Centre is based. The School offers leading research and teaching expertise in a range of fields including international relations, international security, political economy, sociology and social policy, human rights and development studies.

Students in the Master of Peace and Conflict Studies (MPACS) can undertake a supervised internship in a local or international organisation which enables you to consolidate your learning and put theory into practice. If you attain sufficient grades in your MPACS coursework units, you may alternatively complete a supervised dissertation of 12,000 to 15,000 words that counts as research experience for entry into a PhD program.

For more information please visit:
http://goo.gl/QajfC9

Download a copy of the CPACS Postgraduate Guide from our website: http://goo.gl/A71kGG
Patricia Garcia and Abe Quadan hosting the March CPACS meeting of Reconnecting Communities in Conflict. Photo Credit: Maria Ha

Pam Hartgerink (MPACS 2014) assisting Domingas Pereira Soares conduct a 2 day workshop on managing conflict in the home in rural Timor-Leste in April, 2016. Photo Credit: Ilona Hamilton.

CPACS Visiting Scholar and former UN Official Kevin Chang (centre, front row) presented a paper at the ‘Operationalising Human Rights in Peacekeeping Missions’ workshop hosted by the Faculty of Law at the University of New South Wales on 26-27 February 2016.

MPACS graduate, Shamikh Badra and Professor Emeritus and Co-Founder of CPACS, Stuart Rees at the December 2015 graduation ceremony.

CPACS Council President, Erik Paul and CPACS Council Vice President, Emeritus Professor Frank Stilwell meeting in the Peggy Craddock Resource Centre. Photo Credit: Wendy Lambourne

(Left) CPACS Council members and students at the end of year party in the Posters for Peace Gallery. Photo Credit: Wendy Lambourne

MPACS students at other participants in the Creators for Peace Circles Photo Credit: Patricia Garcia
(Above and Below) Mujib Abid, Emily Blizzard, Juliet Bennett, and Narelle Fletcher at the HDR student writing retreat in Katoomba, February 2016. Photo Credit: Wendy Lambourne

(Above) CPACS Librarian and manager of the Resource Centre, Peggy Craddock holding her post after the 2015 AGM. Photo Credit: Wendy Lambourne

(Above and Below) Mujib Abid, Emily Blizzard, Juliet Bennett, and Narelle Fletcher at the HDR student writing retreat in Katoomba, February 2016. Photo Credit: Wendy Lambourne

(Above) Raphael, James, Lydia, Zainab and Godwin outside CPACS April 2016: Photo Credit Wendy Lambourne

(Above) Raphael, James, Lydia, Zainab and Godwin outside CPACS April 2016: Photo Credit Wendy Lambourne

(Above) Raphael, James, Lydia, Zainab and Godwin outside CPACS April 2016: Photo Credit Wendy Lambourne

Dr. Lydia Gitau, Dr. Annie Herro, and Paul Duffill at the launch of Stuart Rees’ A Lover’s Country. Photo Credit: Wendy Lambourne

Want to contribute to the next issue of Peace Writes?
Those who would like to contribute to the next issue of Peace Writes can provide a written piece of work related to peace with justice or photo involving the CPACS community or projects to: arts.cpacs@sydney.edu.au by September 12, 2016 at 9am. Looking forward to your contributions!
Upcoming Events

City of Sydney Peace Prize Lecture

Naomi Klein will deliver the 2016 City of Sydney Peace Prize Lecture at the Sydney Town Hall on Friday 11 November at 6:30pm. Tickets are available at sydneypeacefoundation.org.au.

Sydney Peace Prize Gala Dinner

The Sydney Peace Prize Gala Dinner will take place at the Hilton Sydney on Friday 11 November at 8:30pm. Enjoy a fully-catered three course dinner, and meet and mingle with Naomi Klein and other guests. Tickets are available at sydneypeacefoundation.org.au.

Human Survival Project Tribunal

The nuclear powers - US, Russia, UK, France, China, India, Pakistan, Israel and DPR Korea –will be charged collectively and individually with endangering or tending to endanger continued human existence. The event takes place on 7-8 July in Woolley Common Rm, Woolley Building. For more information please visit: http://goo.gl/gmuR7q

International Peace Research Association General Conference

The 26th IPRA General Conference will be held in Freetown, Sierra Leone from 27th November to the 1st December 2016. The agenda will focus on conflict prevention, post-conflict transformation, and the conflict, disaster risk and sustainable development debate. For more information please visit: http://www.ipra2016.org/

The Centre for Peace and Conflict Studies

Mackie Building (K01)
University of Sydney
NSW 2006
Australia

Ph: +61 2 9351 7686
Email: arts.cpacs@sydney.edu.au
Website: sydney.edu.au/arts/peace_conflict