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Welcome

Welcome to the second edition of the School of Social and Political Sciences Magazine.

Welcome to the second edition of the SSPS Review, and the last for 2015. As will become evident, this year was exceptional for the School. We organised something like 250 events and initiatives, which is testimony to the energy of individuals working in the various disciplines represented in the School. This in turn has really helped drive a significant improvement in awareness of the quality of the School. Sociology has just joined Politics in the top 30 globally in the Times Higher Education World University subject rankings, and overall Social Sciences is now ranked 31st in the world. Of course league tables tell only one part of the story. Another part is the great passion for getting our work out into the wider communities with which we interact. A highlight in this regard has been seeing the success of initiatives such as the Ted Wheelwright Lecture hosted by Political Economy, which attracted around 600 participants. Others this semester include the Festival of Democracy held over a weekend in October, as well as events featuring climate experts Connie Hedegaard and Tim Flannery. We’ve also undertaken valuable research on the changing nature of political participation, especially young people’s use of social media for political engagement, as well as investigating ways of blending online and face-to-face teaching to give students the best learning experience. You’ll find stories about these events and research endeavours in the pages of this magazine. And of course none of this would get the coverage it deserves without the sterling efforts of our academics, chairs of department and our professional staff, especially our Communications and Events team, comprised of Nena and Grace, who put together the Review, the Newsletter and our social media coverage.

Professor Simon Tormey
Head of School
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What's on

Events

Insights: Rethinking Migrants’ Rights

5 November
5.30pm - 7.30pm

The increasing mobility of individuals over international borders has prompted changes in the global and national governance of migration. Currently, such governance equates human mobility with the need to control and regulate, and with the potential for economic development in countries of origin and destination. However, considerations for migrants’ rights are sidelined.

Pro-migrant activists have criticized the dominant approaches to global management of migration to numerous abuses of migrants, highlighting the protection deficit in current policy. In their quest for social justice, they call for a rights-based understanding of causes and outcomes of migration, that goes beyond citizenship rights and human rights. They see social justice as relating to safe, secure, and fairly paid work and access to social protection, dignity, and respect for migrants.

Associate Professor Nicola Piper will discuss the key themes of this argument.

For venue details visit:
- whatson.sydney.edu.au/events/published/rethinking-migrants-rights

Accountability: Why Do We Need It and How Do We Get It?

5 November
6.00pm - 7.30pm

When we hear the words ‘power’ and accountability our thoughts may go first to high-stakes political and legal realms. Edward Snowden’s recent actions, whose global consequences are still playing out, were motivated by his dismay at the ‘divorce of power from accountability’ in state-sanctioned behaviour.

This lecture explores who should be accountable, for what, and to whom, and what is accountability? Why do we need it and how do we get it?

The panel will include:
- Peter Fray, Head of Journalism at UTS
- A/Prof. Susan Park, Department of Government and International Relations at The University of Sydney
- Charles Firth, member of The Chaser
- Dr Aim Sinpeng, Centre for International Security Studies at The University of Sydney

For venue details visit:
- sydney.edu.au/sydney_ideas/lectures/2015/accountability
Sydney Peace Prize Lecture & Award Ceremony

10 November
6.30pm – 10.30pm

George Gittoes AM has been selected to receive this year’s Sydney Peace Prize for his dedication to exposing injustice over a 45 year period as a humanist, artist, activist and filmmaker, and his courage to witness and confront violence in the war zones of the world. He has spent his life using the arts to subdue aggression, promote tolerance, respect and peace.

Hear Gittoes speak about his work for peace with justice and witness the presentation of Australia’s only annual international prize for peace, at the City of Sydney Peace Prize Lecture.

For venue details and to purchase tickets visit:

Accountability on Global Environmental Governance Workshop

18 – 19 December
9.00am – 5.00pm

Presented by the School of Social and Political Sciences and the Sydney Environment Institute, this workshop is the third in a series that brings together scholars from all over the world to apply a coherent theoretical conception of accountability across the various levels, scales, issues and actors that compromise global environmental governance.

Distinguished presenters at this event include:
- Prof. Karin Backstrand
- Prof. Lorraine Elliott
- A/Prof. Aarti Gupta
- Dr. Teresa Kramarz
- Dr. Judith van Leeuwen
- A/Prof. Susan Park
- Dr. Michelle Scobie

For venue details visit:
2015 new academic and professional staff

Dr James Loxton

What’s your current position?
I am a Lecturer in Comparative Politics in the Department of Government and International Relations. My research focuses on political parties and regimes in Latin America.

What were you doing before working at the University of Sydney?
I was doing a postdoctoral visiting fellowship at the Kellogg Institute for International Studies at the University of Notre Dame. Before that, I was living in Toronto, Canada, where I was taking refuge from Harvard and finishing my dissertation.

Can you describe your current projects(s)?
I am working on two major projects. The first is a book on conservative parties in Latin America, that tries to explain why the most successful parties were, paradoxically, those with the deepest roots in authoritarian regimes. The second is an edited volume that looks at such “authoritarian successor parties” from a cross-regional perspective, examining the causes of success and the consequences for democracy of such parties in Africa, Asia, Europe, and Latin America.

Joshua Sim

What’s your current position?
I am currently an Administrative Assistant, assisting with Teaching and Curriculum matters at the School.

What were you doing before working at the University of Sydney?
I was doing a postdoctoral visiting fellowship at the Kellogg Institute for International Studies at the University of Notre Dame. Before that, I was living in Toronto, Canada, where I was taking refuge from Harvard and finishing my dissertation.

What is your background and how did you come to work in SSPS?
Having recently graduated from the University with majors in Anthropology and Gender Studies, I applied to work at the SSPS because I believe that this would be an invaluable experience and a great opportunity for growth within the professional academic settings of the University.

Where can we find you on the weekend?
I like to spend my weekends lazing around with my partner and our (now) 14 month old pug. When we’re not being like a pug, we usually like to explore New South Wales for food and photography trips. But usually we’re being a pug.

Rebecca Simpson

What’s your current role and what do you enjoy the most about your position?
I’m the Communications Coordinator at the Sydney Environment Institute (SEI). I most enjoy the opportunity to spread the word about the amazing environment-related research being undertaken by the various researchers. I also enjoy seeing the excitement people get from attending the Institute’s events.

What is your background and how did you come to work in the SEI?
I have and am still working in radio news. I did my Bachelor of Arts (Media & Communications) at the University and saw the job in the Facebook alumni group. I saw Dr Alana Mann and Prof David Schlosberg were part of the team and I remembered having really great experiences when I had them as my lecturers so I thought I’d like to work with a team like that. Plus I have been interested in environmental politics.

A big thank you to Michelle, Alana and David for the job!
Project Q: Peace & Security in a Quantum Age

In 2014, the Centre for International Security Studies (CISS), with support from the University of Sydney and the Carnegie Corporation of New York, staged a proof-of-concept experiment called the Q Symposium. Held at the former Quarantine Station, Q invited a diverse group of international thinkers to apply next-wave thinking to the most pressing peace and security issues. Scientists, humanists, diplomats, soldiers, and journalists engaged chaos theory to understand events with a sensitive dependence on initial conditions, like a grid failure, flash crash or pandemic; complexity theory to provide insights into adaptive and self-organizing actions, like transnational social movements, drug trafficking or climate change; and quantum theory to explore observer-dependent events like natural disasters, regime change and diplomacy.

The primary focus was on ‘quantum effects’, or observer-dependent global events that phase-shift with media interventions, from states to sub-states, local to global, public to private, organised to chaotic, virtual to real and back again, often in a single news cycle. This appropriation of quantum ideas to better understand global politics was hardly novel. Over 30 years ago, Secretary of State George Shultz and theoretical physicist and arms control expert Sydney Drell coined the term ‘quantum diplomacy’, to describe the difficulties of understanding and negotiating complex security issues under the unblinking eye of the media:

“My views on the media’s role in foreign affairs are heavily influenced by the notion of “quantum diplomacy”. An axiom of quantum theory is that when you observe and measure some piece of a system, you inevitably disturb the whole system. So the process of observation itself is a cause of change. That is all too often the case when a TV camera is right in the middle of some chaotic event, trying to capture its essence objectively. Quantum diplomacy holds that true reality is hard to record.”

Media has since gone social, increasingly visual and truly global. Quantum effects have infiltrated the farthest reaches of diplomacy, warfare and statecraft. But now there is a difference: innovations in quantum computing, communications and intelligence elevate the wave function from the microphysical to the macrophysical and from the metaphorical to the actual. In a world of many possible worlds, this means there is no single essence or true reality to capture or to record, only multiple probabilistic states that collapse into a single actuality upon observation.

CISS has instituted ‘Project Q: Peace and Security in a Quantum Age’, designed to consider the possibility, significance and global impact of a quantum revolution. Over the next two years, ‘Project Q’ will organise a series of symposia, lectures and workshops that will reach across disciplines, step outside of professional siloes, and seek new policy recommendations.

For more information on Project Q:
− projectqsydney.com
Ahead of climate negotiations at the COP21 summit in Paris at the end of the year, Professor Tim Flannery, The Chair of the Climate Council was recently joined by Professor Robyn Eckersley from the University of Melbourne, a specialist in international environmental agreements, Nikola Casule from Greenpeace and Emma Herd, CEO of the Investor Group on Climate Change, for an evening of discussion on the possibility of success at the talks and possibility of reaching an international agreement. The event was co-presented by the Sydney Environment Institute, Sydney Ideas and the Sydney Democracy Network.

Professor Flannery noted the Paris talks are “coming at about the same time as a very interesting inflection point in terms of our emissions growth after just going through a decade of worst-case scenario emissions growth for greenhouse gases.” He pointed to findings from the International Energy Agency, which showed global economic growth had decoupled from the growth in greenhouse gas emissions, for the first time in 40 years. Emissions from the energy sector had, in fact, stalled.

“It’s a very interesting moment. A cautious optimist may think that that announcement means 2014 is a big year for emissions growth and we’re decoupling to heave off that worst-case scenario trajectory. Although commitments from Paris won’t start kicking in till 2020... there are a lot of things happening through this period,” he said.

“I think Paris is very important. On face value we hope that the reductions will get us onto a trajectory, which more likely moves towards three degrees of warming by the end of the century rather than the current four degrees. So that’s good but that’s not merely the battle. But from that perspective Paris is already a success – a success of getting us off the worst-case scenario. It is pretty much impossible that we’ll avoid two degrees of warming.”

The 2007 Australian of the Year highlighted that policymakers need to look to new, ‘Third Way’ technologies. “The third way is a group of technologies, methods and approaches to fight the problem that work by strengthening Earth’s distance self-regulatory processes by drawing CO2 out from the atmosphere,” he said. Examples include seaweed farming to carbon-negative plastic and even carbon-negative concreting. Concrete contributes about 5% of greenhouse gas emissions but by turning a carbon positive technology into a negative one, the CO2 is absorbed into the concrete.

Professor Flannery believes work on these types of technologies need to begin now. “We know from wind and solar, how long it takes for new technologies to reach maturity”. This will involve 20-30 years of investment, research and development but “without this avoiding two degrees of warming is not achievable”. Beyond the science, he has encouraged people to aspire towards a positive outcome.

“During this period we need to maintain our hope as the next decade will be a very tough one to fight climate change because Paris commitments won’t kick in till 2020, we won’t be able to cut emissions as fast as we’d all like and there’ll be no hope of building third way technologies to scale. So between now and 2025, it’s useful to maintain optimism and hope, and after that we might start to see results.”

Written by Rebecca Simpson
In Conversation with Connie Hedegaard

Hedegaard shares her perspectives on the chances of an adequate global agreement being reached at the Paris ‘COP21’

Written by Nick Rowley

Climate change and the public, political and policy debate which has surrounded it in recent years has left many wounded egos and thwarted careers. This has, perhaps, led to a degree of ennui. Not only amongst the public but also many of the academics and campaigners focused on how we better respond to the problem.

To help counter any sense of disengagement, on August 23rd it was a pleasure for the Sydney Democracy Network (SDN) to host Connie Hedegaard: President of the last major international climate meeting at Copenhagen in 2009. Subsequently Hedegaard spent five years as the European Commissioner for Climate Action. She was key to negotiating the European Union’s ambitious commitment to achieve an at least 40% domestic reduction in greenhouse gas emissions compared to 1990 levels by 2030.

You might expect someone so central to complex, fraught international climate negotiations to appear wearied. Not Connie. Ever since I first met her two years prior to the Copenhagen meeting, Hedegaard has always been razor sharp, engaged and at ease considering the means whereby greater progress can be achieved.

Avoiding the standard stage with presentations followed by questions, SDN organized a dialogue with some of Australia’s leading thinkers, practitioners and advocates concerned with the climate problem. These included Jillian Broadbent, Chair of the Clean Energy Finance Corporation; Tim Flannery, Chair of the Climate Council, and Professor Christopher Wright from the Business School. Also involved were representatives of Greenpeace, Oxfam and 350.org.

Introduced by Duncan Ivison, our DVC Research, Hedegaard shared her perspectives on the chances of an adequate global agreement being reached at the Paris ‘COP21’ UN
meeting in December. For Hedegaard, with the US and China now leading with their domestic policy ambition, the dynamics prior to Paris are auspicious. And yet, the veteran of numerous late night international climate negotiations knows that nothing is certain and complex multilateral agreements are notoriously unpredictable.

Expectations prior to Copenhagen were also high, and it is difficult for the French Presidency of the meeting to balance the risk of raising expectations too high versus the risk of failing to engage the wider public and parties to the negotiation on the need for an ambitious and effective climate agreement. For Hedegaard it is likely that Paris will conclude with a meaningful international agreement yet the media will want to herald it either as an unmitigated success or failure. In Paris it will therefore be vital for any agreement to be explained clearly in terms that the public as well as investors, policy makers and major policy makers will understand.

Hedegaard didn’t believe Australia’s commitment to a reduction in greenhouse gas emissions by 26-28% below 2005 levels by 2030 would lead to serious diplomatic criticism. There were more important matters for the French hosts and others to address at the Paris meeting.

Hedegaard concluded with a note of warning. Another failure in Paris would be worse than ‘going back to the drawing board’. It could lead countries to reconsider their existing commitments and the politics of climate change could become damagingly polarized.

SDN looks forward to convening further dialogues with Sydney academics and those with experience in government, advocacy, the private and not for profit sectors on matters of public importance.

---

Sydney Democracy Network

The SDN is a dedicated network of researchers, activists, policymakers and citizens concerned with the future of democracy. Based at the University of Sydney, it has partnerships in Europe, the United States and Asia. It stands for a broad rethinking of democracy, not only as a form of government, but as a way of life committed to greater equality and the accountability of power.

SDN has an active media presence and regularly hosts public events. To find out more visit:

- sydneydemocracynetwork.org

A full transcript of the conversation with Connie Hedegaard is available:

The Civic Network: Young People’s Use of Social Media for Political Engagement

Written by Ariadne Vromen

The Civic Network, a 3 year research project completed in 2015 and funded by the American based Spencer Foundation, compared young people’s use for social media for political engagement in Australia, UK and USA. It was a collaboration led by Ariadne Vromen at the University of Sydney, with Michael Xenos from University of Wisconsin-Madison and Brian Loader, at University of York. We are all active members in the Worldwide Universities Network group, Networking Young Citizens.

We surveyed representative samples of over 3600 young people aged 16-29 across the 3 countries about their social media use and political participation. We also followed up

“A majority [of young people] in Australia and the USA say they learn from Facebook friends who have different political views to them.”

Photo: Facebook
“When compared to celebrities who use social media for politics, politicians were seen by young people as less authentic and less committed to political and social change.”

and had in-depth, online discussions with 107 of these young people. We also undertook in-person focus groups with different kinds of student activists on our university campuses in each country.

So far, we have written and had accepted 7 refereed journal articles, 5 online articles, a special issue of Information, Communication and Society and an edited, The Networked Young Citizen. In the book and special issue we develop the concept of ‘the networked young citizen’:

“Networking young citizens are far less likely to become members of political or civic organizations such as parties or trades unions; they are more likely to participate in horizontal or non-hierarchical networks; they are more project orientated; they reflexively engage in lifestyle politics; they are not dutiful but self-actualizing; their historical reference points are less likely to be those of modern welfare capitalism but rather global information networked capitalism and their social relations are increasingly enacted through a social media networked environment”

Unsurprisingly our already available journal articles have been popular and distributed widely over social media! There have been over 11,000 article views, growing citations, and very high altmetrics scores (it quantifies social media shares). Reinforcing to us that social media matters, not just for our everyday lives but also advertising and distributing our academic publications and research.

Key Findings
- Around 90% of young people in all 3 countries use Facebook. We argue that that the platform has become a ubiquitous part of everyday life.
- Twitter use for politics is less widespread than Facebook, but younger people use it more than older people. The extent of its use by young people varies across our 3 countries from 40% in Australia, 50% in USA to 60% in UK. However, only about 40% of those using twitter in Australia use it for finding out about news and politics this is therefore only 16% of young Australians overall. About a third follow politicians on twitter and this is less than 14% of young people overall.
- Our research suggests that we need to take Facebook much more seriously as a space where young people – purposefully or incidentally – engage with politics, with their networks of friends and family. We have found overall that increasing use of social media leads to more political participation by young people; especially for those young people that have a personalised/
issue-based approach to why political participation matters, rather than a traditional, dutiful orientation that only focuses on formal, electoral politics.

- Facebook’s place in young people’s everyday lives means it has become the place where they first hear about news and major events; a majority in all 3 countries also follow links on Facebook to external news stories. This means there are key people in most young people’s online networks who organise or ‘curate’ information for them, taking over the place of traditional news formats (TV, newspapers, radio) as that first entry point. And this does not lead to an echo chamber of only hearing only one sided views: a majority in Australia and the USA say they learn from Facebook friends who have different political views to them.

- Symbolism in ‘liking’ is important for showing support for issues that young people and their friends care about: 40% like posts on politics in Australia and nearly 50% in the USA. Not everyone comments, or shares posts by their friends, on politics (just over a 1/3 in Australia and UK and 40% in the USA).

- We asked our young people in the in-depth online discussions about this:
  - Most were reluctant to talk about politics too much on social media as it could lead to conflict
  - They were wary of disagreement, arguments and offending someone.
  - Those who weren’t actively participating in politics already wanted social media to be kept as just a social space for family and friends. Some thought political discussion was best done in person.
  - But some who were actively engaged in politics were more optimistic. For example: “I do think it is good. Many people my age have switched off the traditional media, and it is rare to meet somebody who regularly watches the news or reads a newspaper. It is therefore important to spark their engagement in other ways. If they are actively reading, engaging, and being informed by conversations on social media sites, then it creates a more informed public” (female, Australia).

- We also asked them whether they thought politicians should use social media more:
Most thought it was a good idea as politicians should be able to be asked questions publicly, and needed to be responsive to people/ listening to people’s views.

They also thought it was a good way that politicians could focus on sharing information and policy, especially for young people who weren’t watching the news.

Many also thought it could help show politicians were normal people, especially if their messages were positive and genuine. But some were concerned that they wouldn’t be authentic and that their staff would write the messages, not them.

Yet when compared to celebrities who use social media for politics, politicians were seen by young people as less authentic and less committed to political and social change. There are articles coming out soon in journals like Political Studies, on young people’s use of Facebook – and in Media, Culture and Society on the contrast between politicians’ and celebrities use of social media.

Where to next?
One of the theoretical interests underpinning our research was whether social media reverses longstanding trends in the positive relationship between political engagement and high socio-economic status, especially high levels of education. We have found a qualified ‘yes’ in our study, in that less privileged young people now participate more via social media. Yet understanding the effects of inequality is more complicated than our research was able to identify. In future projects we will focus much more on both the subjective meaning of political engagement and how it is shaped by inequality; as well as the increasingly complex relationships between online politics and offline movements for large scale social, economic and political change.

wun.ac.uk/wun/research/view networking-young-citizens

Ariadne Vromen

Ariadne Vromen is a political sociologist with interests in political participation, social movements, advocacy organisations, digital politics, and young people and politics. She is a founding member of the Worldwide Universities Network group, Networking Young Citizens.
A Vision of Hope Under Occupation: Bethlehem University

The daily struggles and hopes of students studying at Palestine’s Bethlehem University

Palestinians surveying their history over the last few decades have precious little cause for optimism, with the theft and colonisation of their land and denial of their rights under Israeli occupation. But, according to Peter Bray, Vice Chancellor of Bethlehem University, in his talk at the University hosted by the Centre for Peace and Conflict Studies, they can still find hope, if hope is to mean: “realising that ‘I’m not going through this by myself’”. The global awareness of their struggle for rights and freedoms, and solidarity of supporters, makes a key contribution to enabling hope for the Palestinians.

The first Palestinian university to be established, in 1973, in the West Bank, Bethlehem has no on-campus accommodation, which means many of its students must pass through Israeli army checkpoints, as well as the illegal separation wall Israel began building in 2002 and sundry other barriers, to reach class each day. In the process, they are exposed to dangers from humiliation, to physical threats, but, Bray remarked: “It’s that resilience and courage that I find inspiring, the way students place that emphasis on their education and are prepared to make those sacrifices”.

Bray, who is a member of the Brothers of the Christian Schools, explained how funding for the University comes partly from the Vatican and partly from student fees, which are kept to a minimum, but he and colleagues must raise 60% of the costs, put at USD$4,000 per student per year, from charitable donations.

The sense of purpose that sustains these efforts comes from the institution’s mission to build the Palestinian nation through education, laying down resources on which it will need to draw deeply, when national rights are finally attained and recognised. One of the most crucial, Br Bray said, will be the relationships nurtured on campus between the University’s Christian and Muslim students. One of its best known graduates, Daoud Nassar, has a farm in the hills southwest of Bethlehem which the Israeli authorities have been attempting to confiscate for many years. He runs educational projects on the property as a “tent of nations” and marks its entrance with a stone on which is inscribed, in several languages, the words: “we refuse to be enemies”.

Nassar was just one of several BU graduates and students who ‘joined’ Br Bray’s presentation in the form of video recordings. One who featured, a 22-year-old undergraduate from Hebron, had “never seen the sea”.

Written by Jake Lynch
While he could stand on high ground in Bethlehem and look down on Jerusalem in the distance, he had never been able to visit it. Unlike westerners, who can generally come and go in the Holy Land as they please, Palestinians are highly restricted in their movements, with the obvious impact on their educational prospects.

In one case, Berlanty Azzam, a fourth-year student from Gaza, was on her way back to Bethlehem from a trip to Ramallah when she was detained by Israeli soldiers at a checkpoint. Seeing the word, ‘Gaza’ on her ID card, they locked her up for seven hours, then blindfolded and handcuffed her and drove her to the Gaza Strip, where she was dumped in the middle of the night.

Efforts to challenge this in the Israeli courts proved fruitless, so Berlanty was stranded, unable to return to the West Bank for the remaining six weeks of her four-year degree course. An international outcry failed to shame Israel into reversing the injustice, so the University instead deployed some lateral thinking. A tutor was engaged in Gaza so Berlanty could complete her studies there. The Chancellor of BU is, it so happens, the Apostolic Delegate, or Pope’s official representative, in Jerusalem. Making use of his diplomatic credentials, he and Br Bray travelled to Gaza to hold a special graduation ceremony so Berlanty could receive her degree.

Parallels with CPACS
In these and so many other ways, Bethlehem University is “a beacon of hope”, Br Bray said. There are parallels with CPACS’ own sense of mission and purpose, and the centrality to its work of concepts such as solidarity in the face of injustice. In attendance was the Centre’s own current student from Gaza, Shamikh Badra, who arrived in Sydney last year shortly before bombs and shells started raining down on his homeland in Israel’s so-called ‘Operation Protective Edge’.

Shortly before Br Bray’s talk, the United Nations Inquiry into this attack published its report, confirming that it claimed 2,251 lives, including the lives of 551 children, displaced more than half a million people, and destroyed 77 health facilities and 261 schools.

On top of the challenges of studying in English in a foreign country, Shamikh’s first semester in Sydney, for his Master of Peace and Conflict Studies degree, was understandably shadowed by personal trauma and horror at the experience being inflicted on his home, his family and friends, while he was thousands of miles away in Australia.

Despite this, his own dedication shone through, and he recently completed his final unit of study, Nonviolence and Social Change, in the Winter School. Shamikh will return home imbued with fresh hope, knowledge and skills, as well as the solidarity of many new friends and colleagues here,
Brother Peter Bray, FSC, EdD is the 8th Vice Chancellor of Bethlehem University, the first university established in Palestinian and the only Catholic university in the Holy Land. He has been with the University since 2009, and has over 30 years of Catholic education experience as a teacher, consultant, administrator, and expert in leadership and educational systems. Brother Bray has a doctorate in Leadership Studies from the University of San Diego with a focus on leadership approaches that facilitate change in educational institutions.

Shamikh’s course fees – many times those at Bethlehem University! – and expenses were met by the Sydney Peace Foundation and through fund-raising efforts by its founding Director, Emeritus Professor Stuart Rees. As CPACS now enters a phase of planning for the next stage of its development, we are inspired by Shamikh’s own story to reach out for help to bring more students here from Palestine, as well as other conflict-affected communities around the world where hope needs to be activated, and its implications and potentialities explored through education as a force for peace and positive change.

This article is based on a talk coordinated by the Centre for Peace and Conflict Studies at the University of Sydney on June 3, 2015.

“...I find inspiring, the way students place that emphasis on their education and are prepared to make those sacrifices”
Party Reform: The Future of Political Parties as Participatory Organisations

Anika Gauja on the changing nature of our willingness to participate in traditional forms of political activity and what this means for political parties

Written by Anika Gauja

In the last half century, party membership in Australia has more than halved. Less than two per cent of the electorate now belong to a political party – a fraction of the membership of the advocacy organisation GetUp and around the same size as the membership of the Melbourne Cricket Ground. With trends like this, many scholars have predicted the terminal decline of political parties as participatory institutions.

The Australian Research Council Discovery Early Career Researcher (DECRA) Project ‘The Politics of Party Reform’ provides a different take on the scale and consequences of the crisis of party decline. Based on three years (2013–2015) of comparative case study research, it does so by examining how political parties, in Australia and the United Kingdom are adapting their organisational structures to reflect how people want to participate in politics today.

Research articles from the project have already been published in the *European Journal of Political Research*, the *British Journal of Politics and International Relations* and the *Australian Journal of Political Science*. In 2016, Oxford University Press will publish *Party Reform: The Causes, Challenges and Consequences of Organisational Change* – a book that analyses the Australian and UK case studies in a broader comparative context.

The changing participatory context

Driven by social changes such as increasing pressures on time, money and effort, a decline of working-class communities and trade union-membership, many scholars have asserted that people are less willing to participate in traditional forms of collective political activity. Rather then joining political parties, citizens have instead turned to other political organisations to channel their participation, or to direct forms of action.

For some, these changing patterns represent the decline of political participation and engagement in
society, but for others they signify a diversification in citizenship norms and political participation away from primarily duty-bound norms and actions to more engaged and autonomous forms of political participation, and to expanding political repertoires that are no longer focused on the formal institutions of the state, such as ethical consumerism, online activism and issues-based campaigning.

The impact on parties
There are two ways in which changes such as these might impact upon the nature of party organisations, particularly as participatory arenas. The first is the potential withdrawal of political parties from society, creating essentially 'hollowed out' organisations. This is the focus of much of the scholarly and public commentary on political parties in Australia and Western Europe. The second option is that political parties change their internal structures and processes to better reflect these patterns of participation. This may require a radical re-thinking of what we mean by the notion of a political party as a mediating institution and where its organisational boundaries lie. At the very least, a more nuanced account of what it means to be active within, or engaged with a political party, is necessary – one that moves beyond the notion of a formal member.

So how are political parties meeting these challenges?
Party rhetoric and public comments made by leading party figures stress that change is necessary. The Australian Labor Party, for example, has committed to pursuing ‘new and innovative measures designed to foster greater participation and engagement of the Australian population in the political process’ and to ‘reform’ and ‘modernise’ by embracing online membership and networks offer people a means of formalising their support for the party without going so far as becoming full members.

Candidate selection through party primaries
In Australia, the Labor Party has also involved its registered supporters in candidate selections through the trial of open primaries for the selection of parliamentary candidates. Marketed as ‘community pre-selections’, voting in these primaries is a one-off event, with supporters pre-registering online but with no further obligation to the party. Community preselections have been conducted by the Nationals in the NSW state seat of Tamworth, by the ALP for the City of Sydney Mayoral Election and most recently in a number of NSW State seats including Newtown, Campbelltown and Balmain.

The future for parties
These developments change how we need to think about political parties as vehicles for participation as well as the trajectory of their organisational adaptation. Parties are certainly not dead, but in envisaging the party of the future we certainly need to move beyond the mass model – to contemplate a more individualised, issues-based and networked form, where the notion of formal party membership has only limited meaning and partisans engage on a more ad-hoc basis with limited commitment to broad-based ideology. 
The 2015 Wheelwright Lecture: Re-envisioning Capitalism & Anti-capitalism

Erik Olin Wright looks at ways of ‘taming’ and ‘eroding capitalism’ for a more equitable social order

Over 500 people packed into the Eastern Avenue Auditorium on August 5th to hear Erik Olin Wright present the 2015 Wheelwright lecture in Political Economy. His topic was ‘Challenging (and perhaps transcending) capitalism through real utopias’. He enthralled the audience with his analysis and advocacy of how to be an anti-capitalist for the twenty-first century.

Why would so many people be interested? In part it is because the annual Wheelwright lecture has become a regular draw-card for the School of Social and Political Sciences, annually attracting many hundreds of students, staff, alumni and members of the general public. Erik Olin Wright’s international reputation also ensured that his presence would attract attention. Based at the University of Wisconsin–Madison, he is one of the world’s leading social scientists, working at the interface of political economy and sociology to understand class, the state and social change.

Wright’s chosen topic for the Wheelwright lecture resonated strongly for many people concerned about the evident problems of modern capitalist societies – problems of instability, insecurity and inequality, for example. Periodic economic crises and recurrent financial instability bedevil the economic system, along with the relentlessly increasing income and wealth inequalities described in Thomas Piketty’s bestselling book Capital in the Twenty-first Century. Hanging like a huge shadow over all these concerns is the challenge posed by climate change and other environmental stresses created by an avaricious, growth-oriented economic system.

Wright’s lecture did not explore these concerns in detail. Rather, he took the view that, because they are all-too-familiar, the big question must be: what is to be done? On the political left this has traditionally led to lively debates about reform versus revolution as anti-capitalist strategies. Seeking to transcend that dichotomy, social scientists like Andre Gorz have proposed the concept (and political program) of ‘radical reforms’, addressing immediate economic and social problems but opening up prospects for more fundamental systemic changes down the track. Wright’s take is rather different, looking for a blend of ‘taming capitalism’ and ‘eroding capitalism’.

‘Smashing capitalism’ cannot be a feasible political strategy, Wright argued, because the system is too strong to be changed by frontal assault. In any case, the historical experience of the ‘smash first, build later’ is that a progressive and participatory political economic order is unlikely to follow. The social democratic approach has so much more to offer as a way of ‘taming capitalism’ to make it more equitable and socially acceptable. Social democracy is not enough, however. Directly developing institutions that are based on more equitable, participatory and sustainable principles is at least equally important.
From such embryos more mature socialist institutions can grow, even within the womb of the current economic order, thereby ‘eroding capitalism’.

Wright gave diverse examples of how such ‘real utopias’ may be developed. They included public libraries, cooperative business forms such as the Mondragon co-op in the Basque region of Spain and experiments with citizens’ budgeting in local government. Even Wikipedia (which we academics often advise our students not to cite when preparing essays!) was paraded as an example of a grassroots, non-profit, institution that new technologies make possible. Fragmentary as they are, these examples show how social needs may be met in non-capitalist ways in the here-and-now.

Perhaps the single most useful step, Wright argued, would be the implementation of a basic income to which all citizens would be entitled irrespective of what work they do or whether they work at all. It would provide the economic security to enable citizens to act in more creative ways, developing non-profit businesses and collaborating in projects for personal and community development. A PhD student in the Department of Political Economy is currently researching and writing his thesis on this topic.

Could Wright’s combination of taming capitalism though social democratic reforms and eroding capitalism through ‘envisioning real utopias’ be a realistic program for radical change, leading to a more stable, equitable and sustainable social order? In concluding his lecture, Wright’s tone was gently optimistic, arguing that it offers the best prospect in the current difficult political economic conditions, although no strategy for social change ever comes with guarantees.
“Smashing capitalism cannot be a feasible political strategy...because the system is too strong to be changed by frontal assault”

Not, surprisingly, opinions among the audience were divided. The dominant reception was supportive, some finding a source of inspiration in the speaker’s positive proposals. There were skeptics on both the political left and right, however, with some making the case for more critical engagement to consider how the two thrusts for progressive social change could operate in tandem and how they might develop cumulative characteristics. A more fully developed class analysis – a somewhat surprising omission for a leading class theorist – would be needed for those purposes. Debates after the lecture and in Hermann’s Bar indicated many such issues of concern about the proffered prognosis.

Isn’t that what public lectures are for – to inform, to challenge and to provoke further analysis? By those criteria, the 2015 Wheelwright lecture was a resounding success. The same may be said of each of the Wheelwright lectures during the last eight years since the series began. Ted Wheelwright himself would surely have approved. He taught political economy at Sydney from the 1950s to the 1980s and was widely regarded as a great teacher and a controversial public intellectual. The lectures held in his honour continue that tradition.

Professor Erik Olin Wright’s 2015 Wheelwright lecture can be seen on video on the School’s website:

- ppesydney.net/challenging-and-maybe-transcending-capitalism-through-real-utopias/

While in Sydney Wright also spoke at Macquarie University, UNSW, and UWS. Next year’s Wheelwright lecture will be presented by Professor David Ruccio, a leading political economist from Notre Dame University in the USA.
Money, money, money

and politics

Groundbreaking research that will enable officials to build effective political financing regulations in any country

Written by Andrea Abel van Es and Lisa Fennis

The role of money in politics challenges states worldwide, both rich and poor. Its abuse raises problems of graft, corruption and cronyism. It undermines legitimacy and governance. In recent years, financial scandals have erupted all over the world.

For example, not often lumped together, the United States, Russia and South Africa all face significant challenges regulating the role of money in politics. Through careful manipulation and extreme regulation of political finance in Russia, Vladimir Putin and his United Russia party have been able to entrench their rule. In South Africa, the complete lack of regulation – bar public funding – has allowed the African National Congress to maintain its dominance. The American system of political financing is so regulated that opportunities for political participation have become inherently unequal.

But we need not look offshore to see how debilitating the misuse of money and state resources is for representative government – who can forget the scandals unearthed by the Independent Commission Against Corruption that plagued NSW politics in recent years, recent reports about the Calabrian Mafia seeking clout within the Liberal Party, or allegations that Opposition Leader Bill Shorten forgot to disclose a $40k donation from business mates.

Indeed, scandals over money in politics are in the headlines every day somewhere around the world. Yet money is essential for mobilizing election campaigns, sustaining political party organizations, and communicating with citizens. And countries such as Sweden have managed to avoid falling foul of malfeasance and graft, despite almost no regulation of money in politics.

“To design a ‘good’ system of political financing is to realize that a one-size-fits-all blueprint does not exist”
So how can the role of money in politics be cleaned up most effectively?

As the issue of effective regulation is rising to the top of the agenda for the international community and domestic reformers, the Electoral Integrity Project (EIP), based at the Department of Government and International Relations and Harvard University, has collaborated with US-based organisations Global Integrity (GI) and the Sunlight Foundation, to generate research and analysis that civil society, elected officials, regulators and the media can use to build more effective political financing regulations in any country.

The Money, Politics and Transparency project is made possible by generous support from the Hewlett Foundation and Open Society Foundations and investigated three crucial questions: How do states around the world attempt to regulate the role of money in politics? What triggers landmark reforms? And, what ‘works’, what fails and why?

In an interactive dataset, the project website (moneypoliticstransparency.org) presents evidence from its Political Finance Indicators, comparing 54 countries worldwide. The Checkbook Elections executive report compares how this problem is tackled in emerging economies as diverse as India, Mexico, South Africa, and Russia, as well as in established democracies such as Britain, Japan, Sweden, and the US.

The findings of the project have attracted considerable media attention, and were presented at multiple international conferences and meetings. Pippa Norris, Andrea Abel van Es and Lisa Fennis placed a blog with the Washington Post’s Monkey Cage, and several other blogs, articles and announcements appeared in The Conversation, The Guardian, and Foreign Policy Democracy Lab, as well as media outlets across Sweden, Indonesia, Malaysia, Argentina, and South Africa. The work was also presented at the Council of Europe’s Lisbon Forum in Tunis in June 2015; an EIP workshop organized as an ancillary event to the Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association in San Francisco; and at International IDEA’s Global Conference on Money in Politics in Mexico in September 2015. Further activities are being set up for November 2015, namely an event with the US Federal Election Commission.

How do states regulate money in politics?

Policies regulating the role of money in politics include disclosure requirements, contribution limits, spending caps, and public subsidies. Most countries use a combination of these policies to try and regulate the flow of money into the political arena. Another way to think about regulation is in terms of the degree to which states intervene in the system of political financing; this can range from laissez-faire or minimal intervention such as only having transparency requirements, to extremely comprehensive regulations involving all four policy types.

Using data from International IDEA, the project uses statistical techniques to show that countries such as South Africa, Sweden and India have more laissez-faire policies, while others such as Brazil, Indonesia and Russia are more interventionist.

But it is difficult to say whether more or less legal control is better. As the map over the page shows, countries with more laws on the books are not necessarily closer to achieving a level playing field in party competition, more transparency or less corruption.

Continued over...
India, for example, has a highly regulated system of political financing but its enforcement capabilities are so weak that more laws simply encourage political actors to find loopholes. And not every country is like Sweden. Despite a lack of regulation, its unique social and political culture allows it to have a highly effective and egalitarian system of political funding with high levels of transparency and a level playing field in party competition.

The project’s political finance indicators find that transparency requirements are one of the most common reforms during the last decade. But disclosure rules are often inconsistently applied. The results suggest that eight out of ten countries have statutes requiring parties and/or candidates to submit contribution and expenditure reports. Yet in reality this rarely happens and the public is often unable to access much of the information.

Furthermore, restrictions on contributions and expenditures are often undermined by loopholes. For example, laws often limit the amount an individual can donate directly to a political party OR to a candidate, but not both. Similar loopholes in regard to anonymous and corporate donations are common. Spending limits also fail in many cases, and very few countries regulate election spending by non-profits, unions, and independent groups. This is regarded as private activities in civil society. Finally, states have adopted public funding and subsidy laws to reduce dependence upon private sector donors and the dwindling band of party members. In practice, however, funds can be unfairly allocated or subject to misuse and abuse by ruling parties and candidates.

So how do we clean up politics?
Effective laws depend upon enforcement capabilities, political will, and autonomous oversight agencies. Unfortunately oversight bodies are often hamstrung through a lack of merit-based appointments, independent leadership, technical capacity, and authority.

Partisan appointments, insufficient staff and budget, and/or a lack of substantive legal power hinder oversight bodies in countries as diverse as the US, Romania, Nigeria and Russia.

Moreover, to design a ‘good’ system of political financing is to realize that a one-size-fits-all blueprint does not exist: much will depend on country specific factors that determine the trade-off between, or emphasis of, particular norms and values. For example, the US is all about individual freedom of expression, and this is acutely reflected in its haste to deregulate political finance: the trade-off of course is that political participation becomes highly unequal.

Equally important, is that no single policy can control money in politics. For instance, public funding without spending or contribution limits can lead to a campaign finance arms race. Disclosure requirements without spending caps or equitable public funding may erode public trust in the electoral process. The project finds that it is more effective to use a balanced mix of regulations fitting each country.

For more information, including the report Checkbook Elections, detailed case studies and the Political Finance Indicators, visit:

- http://moneypoliticstransparency.org/
Fellowships

Visiting International Fellowship at University of Exeter

Anika Gauja (Government and International Relations) has been awarded a Visiting International Fellowship at the University of Exeter, United Kingdom. In February 2016 she will be based in the Department of Politics where she will be collaborating together with Professor Nicole Bolleyer on a European Research Council funded project ‘Regulating Civil Society’.

For details visit:
- socialsciences.exeter.ac.uk/regulatingcivilsociety/

Laffan and KF Laureate Fellowships

Dr Anna Boucher has been awarded the University of Sydney Laffan Fellowship for 2015-6. She will be finalising her second book, Crossroads of Migration: A Global Approach to National Differences (CUP, NY) and initiating a new project on migrant rights in oil and mineral rich democracies.

She has also been selected for the ARC KF Laureate Fellowship Mentoring Scheme for women in the Social Sciences at the University of Melbourne in December 2015.

Awards

Henry Mayer Prize

Dr Stephen Mills, from the Graduate School of Government, was recently awarded the biannual Australian Political Studies Association (APSA) Henry Mayer Prize in recognition of his excellent study, The Professional: Strategy, Money and the Rise of the Political Campaigner. The book is based on Stephen’s PhD thesis, which he completed in 2013 with Emeritus Professor Rodney Tiffen as his supervisor.

FASS Teaching Excellence Awards

The annual awards are handed out for the ability to promote curiosity and to stimulate independent learning and critical thought, innovation in the design and delivery of units, and evidence of effective and sympathetic guidance and advising of students.

The prizes for Faculty Teaching Excellence were awarded to Alex Lefebvre (GIR/PHIL), Elizabeth Hill (PE), Gaynor McDonald (ANTH), John Mikler (GIR), and Leticia Anderson (CPACS).

The Dean’s Citation for Tutorial Teaching with Distinction was awarded to Anupom Roy (ANTH), Alex Page (SSP), and Jessica Richards (SSP).

The Dean’s Citation for Tutorials was received by Lyndal Spence (SSP), Nicholas Broomfield (GIR), and Shazia Lateef (GIR)

ASEAN Forum 3 Minute Thesis Competition

Ly Phan, PhD Candidate at the Department of Sociology and Social Policy, has won the Second Prize in the 3 Minute Thesis Competition at the ASEAN Forum, organised by the Sydney Southeast Asia Center in early October. The prize was awarded based on votes from an audience with diverse backgrounds in all disciplines. Ly Phan’s research examines how women’s empowerment affects their childbearing preference, including their ideal number of children and the preference for sons in Southeast Asia.
Two research Fellows reflect on their time in Europe’s largest social science research institute, the WZB

Associate Professor Charlotte Epstein

My six weeks spent at the WZB in Berlin involved meeting the delightfully caring and welcoming Gudrun Mouna, and, progressively, Michael Zurn, and various members of the Global Governance group, which he directs, Jeanette Hofmann and her dynamic team comprising the Internet Policy Field, which she directs, and which was particularly relevant to my own research on surveillance, and various members of Wolfgang Merkel’s Democracy Group, which was hosting me. I also had a spirited meeting with the WZB’s welcoming and personable director, Jutta Allmendiger.

My hosts at the WZB seemed especially keen to have me: I was surprised to hear that the exchange scheme had been much more amply used in the other direction, but that few Sydney researchers had taken the opportunity. I would really encourage my colleagues to seize it. I can particularly recommend the extraordinarily generous and helpful librarians, who will give you a personalised tour – and then offer to compose entire bibliographies for you…

The WZB offered the quiet writing retreat I was seeking in order to delve into my genealogy of the place of the body in the making of modern sovereignty.

Berlin was an extraordinary productive location for researching surveillance activism. I had the opportunity to meet ‘hackers’ who have been able to ‘fake’ the biometric of the German foreign minister, based on a glass left on a table after a conference. The combination of a historically vibrant political activism scene, combined with an astute sensitivity to the damages of the surveillance state made Berlin a particularly good place for critically observing the latest developments in the European Union around the use of surveillance technologies in migration and border control systems, such as the EURODAC scheme, which I studied especially closely. Work and play often blended in Berlin – for example, when I visited Teufelsberg, literally ‘the devil’s mountain’, an artificial mountain in the middle of Berlin made out of the ruins of WW1 which became the number one spying site for the Western powers listening in on the East, up until the fall of the wall.
The WZB building, where I spent three months in the spring of this year as visiting researcher under the Berlin Doctoral Fellowship of the University on Sydney, is located in one of the most beautiful corners of Berlin. Although it is at walking distance from Potsdamer Platz, one of the most trafficked intersections of Berlin, it is immersed in tranquility. The old part of the building, constructed in 1894 to house the Reichsversicherungsamt (the Imperial Office of Social Insurance), faces the Landwehrkanal that flows toward the Tiergarten. The modern wings and the library, which towers over the courtyard, were added in the 1980s to the much more imposing structure erected in the previous century. The distance from the two architectural styles, which I crossed every morning walking from the main entrance to my office, located in the modern part of the building, was stunning and extremely fascinating.

My PhD research aims to describe everyday political interactions between Internet users. The abundance of digital traces left behind by online interactions, being posts, comments or likes, suggests using quantitative methods to make sense of the data and to map - a verb frequently used by Internet researchers - online behaviours of hundreds of thousands of users. Yet meanings attached to these particular behaviours are of course not self-evident and far from easy to determine. Why do people talk politics online? What meanings they attach to their online (inter)actions? Do they replicate offline attitudes towards politics? And more in general, what’s the effect of social networking sites on political organisations?

I found at the WZB a strong interest in the new set of data made available by the revolution in personal communication technologies that took place over the last decade and in its impacts on politics and political organisation. WZB researchers are strongly engaged with quantitative methods applied to the textual analysis of political documents. The WZB hosts the research team of the Manifesto Project that, by manually coding parties’ manifestos, opens the way to granular quantitative analyses on the evolution of party politics. Nevertheless, I also found a healthy skepticism towards a data-driven approach that some saw as too detached from theoretical reasoning. Every two weeks I sat down with my research unit on Democracy and Democratisation to discuss a paper presented by visiting researchers or by a member of the research team. The debate was often passionate and I very much appreciated the theoretical problems raised especially by senior colleagues and the focus on limitations and interpretability of quantifiable data.

The experience at the WZB positively contributed to my research and helped me steer it on solid theoretical grounds. By being critically engaged on the relevance of my research questions and challenged to approach my data in the light of the tradition of political research, I refined my understanding of where and how I see my contribution to the field. Moreover, I brought home a wide network of contacts that, thanks to the impressive number of visiting researchers, is certainly not limited to Berlin or Germany.
New grants

Understanding the Effectiveness of Digital Inclusion Interventions in Schools

Associate Professor Karl Maton, Department of Sociology and Social Policy, is a co-chief investigator in a team led by Swinburne University of Technology, partnering university scholars with One Laptop Per Child Australia Pty Ltd to understand the effectiveness of the distribution and adaptation of digital practices across Indigenous and non-Indigenous low socio-economic schools.

Regulating Autologous Stem Cell Therapies in Australia

Professor Catherine Waldby, formerly of the Department of Sociology and Social Policy, is a co-chief investigator in a team led by Professor Cameron Stewart, Pro Dean at Sydney Law School for the project Regulating Autologous Stem Cell Therapies in Australia – partnering university researchers with Multiple Sclerosis Research Australia, Arthritis Australia and the Motor Neurone Disease Association of Australia. The project aims to develop an ethical and regulatory framework for the use of autologous adult stem cell therapies in Australia.

Adequacy of Organisational Responses to Whistleblowing

Professor Rodney Smith, Department of Government and International Relations, is a co-chief investigator in a project on whistleblowing led by Griffith University and partnering university scholars with organisations including CPA Australia, Office of the Commonwealth Ombudsman and the Public Sector Commission. The project will examine the adequacy of organisational responses to whistleblowing and identify factors that influence responses across a range of institutions, in order to provide a clearer basis for reform of policies, procedures and law; and set benchmarks for comparative research worldwide.

Global Economic Governance and the Development Practices of the ‘Other’ Multilateral Development

Associate Professor Susan Park, from the Department of Government and International Relations, ran a workshop bringing together participants for an edited collection titled Global Economic Governance and the Development Practices of the ‘Other’ Multilateral Development Banks. This is the first collection to bring together cutting edge research on the Banks: covering Asia, Africa, Latin America, Europe, within the changing geopolitics of development.

Accountability in Global Environmental Governance?

Coordinated by Associate Professor Susan Park, from the Department of Government and International Relations, the workshop was a first cut at exploring the public, private, voluntary components of global environmental governance and how accountability differs across these institutional types. It included scholars from around the world as part of the annual International Studies Association conference, leading to a special section of a peer reviewed journal.

Visiting Scholars

Patricia Garcia

Patricia Garcia is a visiting scholar with the Centre for Peace and Conflict Studies, and is undertaking research and project work on grass-roots community led peacebuilding approaches, with a view to developing practical and work related skills for putting peace into practice.

Having spent the past few decades living and working in war zones around the world, and managing humanitarian relief and recovery programs, Patricia has also recently been named as a finalist for the Australian of the Year Awards 2016.

Polina Smiragina

Polina Smiragina, from the Department of Sociology and Social Policy, will be based in the Department of Criminology at Stockholm University, as a PhD visiting scholar during the winter.

Polina’s research aims to identify the causes and consequences of the invisibility of male victims of human trafficking, by conducting a thorough analysis of male trafficking discourses through concepts of masculinity, victimization, Pierre Bourdieu’s cultural capital and the hierarchy of victimhood theory.

Rossella Ibrahim

Rossella Ibrahim, from the University of Genoa, is a PhD visiting scholar with the Department of Political Economy. The aim of her research is to provide a historical analysis both of the development of the political role of the IMF and its internal political thought.
Legitimation Code Theory (LCT) is a conceptual framework for analysing and shaping practice, created and developed by A/Prof Karl Maton (Department of Sociology and Social Policy) that now underpins an international and interdisciplinary community. LCT began in studies of education and knowledge but is now used to explore diverse social practices across different institutional and national contexts, both within and beyond education. Though only a decade old, LCT has already been central to four ARC national grants, over 160 publications, over 350 conference papers and 75 PhDs. In SSPS, LCT is the focus of a fortnightly ‘Roundtable’ seminar series, a weekly PhD Workshop, an ARC Discovery Project and an ARC Linkage Project.

In June the First International LCT Conference was held in Cape Town, South Africa, supported by Cape Peninsula University of Technology, Rhodes University, and the University of Cape Town.

The first day comprised seminars that showcased cutting-edge developments from the PEAK Project into ‘Pedagogies for knowledge-building’. This ARC Discovery Project study, led by Karl Maton, explores the basis of knowledge-building in secondary school classroom practices. Two entirely new dimensions of the LCT framework were revealed in these seminars, which also involved presentations by Dr Sarah K. Howard from University of Wollongong and Dr Jodie L. Martin from Australian Catholic University.

The conference itself involved over 80 participants and 46 presentations by scholars from Australia, South Africa, Denmark, Korea, Denmark, and elsewhere. These papers covered a wide range of practices, from the training of emergency services to the nature of parliamentary procedures and from ballet to physics.

The School was extremely well represented at the conference. In addition to the Opening Address by Karl Maton, papers were presented on ongoing doctoral research by Sharon Aris (school choice), Elena Lambrinos (dance education), Patrick Locke (marketisation of TAFE), Saul Richardson (jazz education), Mathew Toll (climate change denialism) and Kirstin Wilmot (PhD writing), all from the Department of Sociology & Social Policy.

The conference was followed by two capacity-building events. Professional development workshops introduced academic developers involved in training teaching staff at Stellenbosch University to the latest developments in LCT praxis. Karl Maton, Dr Sherran Clarence (Rhodes University, South Africa) and Steve Kirk (Durham University, UK) revealed how LCT can be embedded into teaching and learning practices in order to maximise educational outcomes and enable cumulative knowledge-building. A ‘writing retreat’ was also held by Cape Peninsula University of Technology at which Karl Maton supervised 20 young scholars, supporting their ongoing research and developing publications.

Planning is underway for the Second International LCT Conference, to be held at the University of Sydney in July 2017.

- legitimatocodetheory.com/

@LCTTheory
Festival of Democracy

The Sydney Democracy Network held the 3rd annual Festival of Democracy, which brings together thinkers, activists, and policy makers to discuss the health of democracy in Australia and around the world.

This year’s event focused on the threat posed to democratic rights by surveillance, unstable governments, and violence. Our panelists included:

- Julian Assange & Senator Scott Ludlam on despair and defiance
- Helen Caldicott on South Australia’s nuclear industry
- Francisco Jurado Gilabert on the Spanish Podemos political party
- Bernard Keane on surveillance and citizen rights
- Dr Stephen Mills on “campaigning” beyond the electoral context
- Professor James Der Derian on Machiavelli and effective leadership in the 21st century
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Why COP21 Paris Doesn’t Define Climate Action

Lisette Collins reveals how local councils are tackling the climate change issue in Australia

Written by Lisette Collins

As we get closer to the 21st Conference of the Parties (COP) in Paris in November & December, the thought pieces, blogs, and public lectures have been piling up. What will success at COP 21 look like? What will it mean for global climate efforts? What if it is a failure? But is all this time, energy, and media scrutiny misplaced? As someone who has been working in the Australian climate change adaptation space for the past four years, I believe so. Many are unaware that a lot of the groundwork on climate action has already begun at the local level across the country.

For the past three decades, the international community has debated the veracity of climate science, employed market mechanisms for reducing carbon emissions (to varying success), and debated reduction targets, as Smaller Island Developing States (and later other developing countries) have pleaded for action to halt the climate impacts they have been experiencing over the past few years. Australia is a laggard when it comes to emissions reduction, with a poor target to take to Paris and the political baggage of climate sceptics in key political positions. What most Australians don’t know, is that local councils have been developing climate change adaptation plans (CCAPs) since 2007, with well over 100 plans across the country. The Federal government may be dragging its feet, but local councils have been all over this for years.

The most recent council to release its CCAP was the City of Sydney. The adaptation strategy was developed with the input of internal and external stakeholders as well as the input of our Sydney University Research team (Professor David Schlosberg, Dr Simon Niemeyer and myself) who designed a Citizens’ Panel to contribute to the development of the CCAP. The strategy now includes the concerns raised by citizens through that Panel, with citizen endorsed actions and prioritised risks highlighted throughout. This policy development is independent of COP 21, and with real implications for overcoming the challenges presented by climate impacts.

For the most part, CCAP development has evaded attention in Australia. The general public are largely unaware of the amount of work their local councils have done in this space, and a lot of that conscious ‘under-the-radar’ approach can be traced back to negative politics over climate change in the country. Regardless of the outcome in Paris, local councils will continue to plan for the extreme weather events brought about by climate change, especially the ones they are already beginning to face such as prolonged heatwaves, severe bushfires, and wild storm weather. Furthermore, as pointed out at the recent Sydney Ideas event “A Global Climate Deal in 2015?”, civil society has and will continue to play a huge role in building momentum for climate action. Canadian author and activist Naomi Klein rightfully devotes chapters to the progress of social movements and grassroots
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activists across the world in achieving climate wins in her climate change bestseller “This Changes Everything.” Increasingly, it is the efforts of local communities who Lock the Gate, participate in blockadia, divest, and campaign for climate action which creates the momentum needed to face the climate challenge.

And the momentum in Australia is not just underway in the adaptation space. The recent release of the movie ‘Frackman’ and successful launch of ‘Powershop’ (which recently partnered with Oxfam) over the past year indicate that Australians are increasingly aware of the need to mitigate emissions, to reconnect with the Earth, and to work towards a non-polluting economy. Recent interview research conducted for my Ph.D. thesis also indicates that Australians do not always distinguish between mitigation and adaptation specifically, but rather approach the issue with a focus on holistic, interconnected strategies to deal with the climate change problem.

Paris is not the be-all and end-all for global climate change action. Incremental changes over the past ten years have delivered pockets of success all over the globe, and those will continue post-Paris regardless of what happens. Why wait for the outcomes of Paris? There is plenty of engagement already taking place.

“The general public are largely unaware of the amount of work their local councils have done in this space.. that ‘under-the-radar’ approach can be traced back to negative politics over climate change in the country.”

---

**Lisette Collins**

Lisette is a PhD candidate in the Department of Government and International Relations at the University of Sydney, specialising in climate change adaptation policy at the local government level across Australia.

Follow Lisette’s research:

- lisette-collins.squarespace.com/
#PeaceDayChallenge: Peace Within Montgomery

Centre for Peace and Conflict Studies graduate Natilee McGruder brings Practical Peacebuilding to Montgomery, Alabama

Written by Natilee A. McGruder

Peace Within MGM is both an ongoing movement and an event in the historic city of Montgomery, Alabama that challenges people everywhere to act in the name of a better quality of life. Creator and University of Sydney Center for Peace and Conflict Studies graduate, Natilee McGruder, used the theme Practical Peacebuilding to describe acting daily in our communities, with our loved ones, friends, and strangers, to make us all stronger, healthier and happier. Peace Within MGM created a several month long celebration that uplifted the stories of Local Peacebuilders, created opportunity for students to use art during the Young Artists for Peace Contest and culminated on the International Day of Peace, September 21st, 2015 with the #PeaceDayChallenge and the Peace Within MGM Unconference.

Peace Within MGM engaged schools and communities of faith around the city who participated in a #PeaceDayChallenge that asked them to write down what action they will take as individuals to create peace in their community. This challenge was in partnership with the US Institute of Peace, who sponsored the campaign globally. The next step for those who took the challenge in Montgomery is to create a physical or virtual wall with their recorded challenges so that they can track their progress throughout the year. The Montgomery community embraced Peace Day fully: Mayor Todd Strange and the City Council sponsored the Peace Within MGM Unconference and Superintendent Margaret Allen and the Montgomery Public School Board proclaimed September 21st as “MPS Peace Day.”

The Peace Within MGM Unconference, held that afternoon at a local community center, was a successful social experiment that brought together 100+ people from the city, 37 of whom were local high school students. Natilee used the

“Ongoing journey with Peace Within MGM is to.... gain blueprints on how to act for the toughest problems faced globally AND within the city of Montgomery”
World Cafe methodology to structure the dialogue-driven event, adding live performances, artistic expression and movement to inspire critical thinking and spark conversation among the participants.

The events capitalized on Peace Day, which fell between the 50th Anniversary of the Selma to Montgomery Marches and the 60th Anniversary of the Montgomery Bus Boycott. Accordingly, Natilee used many of the same tools of the American Civil Rights Movement. These tools include but are not limited to: respect, compassion, strategic planning, practical skills sharing, sharing goods and information, deliberately occupying space and land, regular and robust community dialogue and fellowship, eating homegrown and home cooked food, and plenty of time spent learning, working and playing outdoors in our natural environment.

Natilee’s ongoing journey with Peace Within MGM is to uplift the stories and best practices of local peacebuilders to gain blueprints on how to act for the toughest problems faced globally AND within the city of Montgomery: systemic poverty, violence, hunger, social and economic injustice and mental illness.

For more information visit:

- peacewithinmgm.com
In 2013, I started my Masters in Development Studies and after some courses and a better understanding of development I decided to do an internship in this area. I already had a stable job I enjoyed at a research agency in Sydney, but I wanted to experience a totally new culture and the different working dynamics at a not-for-profit. I always dreamt of working for the United Nations and an internship was my best shot at making this dream come true.

The long and tedious process of applying for internship positions, writing cover letters and resumes became part of my routine. But eventually, after a few months, many attempts, e-mails and non-responses to my applications, I finally got accepted to work for the UN Women Cambodian Country Office. I was set to start the greatest adventure of my life, working in Phnom Penh, the capital of Cambodia in the Women's Economic Empowerment Programme. Needless to say, I had little knowledge of Cambodia, but the prospect of the unknown made the whole experience and journey even more exciting.

In preparation for the five month long internship I started to read all the books I could get my hands on about Cambodian history, culture, food, flora, fauna and places to visit. I also had to familiarise myself with the concepts of gender equality, empowerment and the work UN Women has been doing since the office was established in Cambodia in 2010.

The UN Women Office is much like any other, there are Post-it notes everywhere and get togethers for lunch, but there were also weekly meetings to discuss projects and policy frameworks, workshops on career development and management skills, forums, events and a shared passion for gender equality. As an intern, I was exposed to a wide range of projects and was invited to attend meetings, working groups, field visits, training and capacity building sessions. I was also lucky to have a mentor during my internship and the opportunity to undertake research assignments on social protection and women's migration, given my background in social research. Inevitably, gender equality and women's empowerment became my special interest after the internship.

The everyday work at the UN Women office and the first hand living experience in Phnom Penh contributed to an enriching cultural and political understanding of the society I was briefly a part of. I had the opportunity to meet locals, international development workers, volunteers and other interns, and was inspired by everyone's life story and the work in which they were involved. I quickly became a part of the expat community in Phnom Penh, where political, human rights and gender discussions over dinner and drinks were standard.

I was also mindful that local knowledge would give me the best insight into the Cambodian culture and society. My working colleagues would take me to local markets, traditional restaurants and badminton games on the weekends (a popular sport in Phnom Penh). I also tried exotic fruits and vegetables that were always shared at the office, and acquired a taste for ice coffee.

Today I have fond memories of my time in Cambodia. I’ve made some great friends, worked hard, learnt as much as I could and now I’m even more determined to advocate for gender equality and women’s empowerment.
In early 2015 the Graduate School of Government (GSG) delivered the Australian government funded program Mining Resources: Regulation and Revenue Management as part of the Australia Awards in Africa program. The in-Africa component of the training was conducted over five weeks in two locations: Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, and Harare, Zimbabwe. In both locations the University enjoyed strong support from the Australian Embassies with Ambassadors and their representatives attending sessions, launching and closing the training. At the closing session in Addis Ababa, Australian Ambassador to Ethiopia, His Excellency Mark Sawers, made the following comment:

“Australia is not a big provider of development to Africa, our contribution is modest. But we can bring the right expertise. At a fundamental level – this is about confidence – government in industry and industry in government and decision making – important decisions that will stick.”

The 21 Fellows represented a total of 11 countries: Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Ghana, Kenya, Madagascar, Malawi, Niger, Nigeria, Rwanda, Tanzania and Togo. GSG delivered a total of five modules in Africa: Governance of Extractive Industries; Research Methods and Knowledge Transfer; Mineral Development Agreements, Mining Contracts and Production Sharing Agreements; Mining Tax Law and Revenue Management; and Evaluation, Investment and Accounting. The in-Africa delivery was enhanced by African presenters sharing local expertise and the inclusion of a local cohort in each location. The Fellows then returned home for 2-3 weeks before embarking on the Australian leg of the program. In March they undertook the module Mining Resources, the Australian Context delivered in Perth by Professor Geoff Gallop followed by a two week program.
“You won’t believe the insights I am giving in shaping the regulations and how I have come to be regarded as a key resource person.”

— Colin Ngigi, Kenya

in Sydney. The Sydney program included a Workshop delivered by the Australian Human Rights Commission. Highlights of the workshop included sessions facilitated by Australian Human Rights Commissioner, Professor Gillian Triggs, on Extractive Industries and Human Rights and by Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Commissioner, Mick Gooda, on Extractive Industries and Indigenous Rights.

In Sydney participants completed the research component of their program supervised by GSG and Sydney Law School staff and made a presentation of their research recommendations to an expert panel.

Some weeks after returning home participant Colin Ngigi, Senior Superintendent Inspector of Mines with the Ministry of Mines, Kenya, reported the following back to the course director:

“We are working on mining regulations for our soon to be enacted mining law. You won’t believe the insights I am giving in shaping the regulations and how I have come to be regarded as a key resource person. Thanks to you and especially Penny and Lee for the eye opening training.”

The program focused on practical skills transfer resulting in the Work Plan on Return whereby Fellows developed an implementable project based on their research. The research projects were of a very high standard and, since returning to their workplaces in April, Fellows have reported a high level of implementation and knowledge transfer activities. Research questions were quite varied but some common themes included: company commitment to corporate social responsibility and environmental sustainability; maximising government revenue from extractive industries and improving contract negotiation skills and methods.

Short Course Awards

Short course awards provide an excellent opportunity for individual and organisational capacity building. Participants acquire essential practical skills relevant to their daily tasks and the knowledge transfer component ensures that the benefit is maximised for their organisations. GSG has been delivering, and improving, programs in the governance of extractive industries since 2008. The different components: in-Africa training; research; work-place reflection; Australian study tour; and peer networking provide a learning experience that delivers international best practice and workplace relevance.
Adventures in Blended Learning Land

Robert van Krieken explores the challenges and practicality of teaching and learning in an increasingly digital landscape

Written by Robert van Krieken

When I started coordinating Introduction to Sociology 1 and 2 in 2014, there were two problems I was hoping to address. The first was getting students to read. Perhaps I’m old-fashioned, but I wanted students to come out the other end of the unit knowing more than when they started, and with a solid-enough foundation for their senior sociology and social policy units.

The second was to improve their engagement with the lectures. Attendance would usually drop precipitously in the course of the semester, so it seemed that there was some sort of crisis at play, perhaps with the lecture format itself. I think I’ve managed to address the first problem fairly successfully, and I can’t yet decide if I’ve failed miserably in relation to the second.

In both cases I turned to the use of digital material and approaches of various sorts, some already existing and others that I needed to create. In relation to the reading issue, I developed weekly online quizzes based on the reading, which are part of the participation mark, with a view to increasing their motivation to do the reading. This has worked to some extent, but I gather that many students treat the reading primarily as the source of answers to the quiz questions, which is not the idea.

In relation to lectures, I decided, with the help of a large Educational Innovation Grant, to turn a 2-hour face-to-face lecture slot into a combination of some video lectures and a 1-hour face-to-face lecture, where the provision of content takes place in the video lectures, and the face-to-face lecture time gets used in a more interactive way, illustrating or developing the ideas in the reading and the video lectures, engaging with case studies, and so on.

How did that work? Well, most students just went ‘woo hoo! only one hour of lecture’, and blew off watching the video

“Video lectures have the advantage of being more under the control of the viewer, they can speed it up or slow it down to suit their comprehension of the material”
lectures. It seemed that they didn’t like having to stick to a weekly routine. I was producing them ‘just in time’, but my guess is that if the whole semester’s video-lectures are available at the beginning of semester, they’ll be more inclined to watch them in bunches, at times that suit them. Once I learned how to include quiz questions in the videos, I was able to stimulate their motivation by telling them that a proportion of the final exam would cover those quiz questions and the content of the videos. This doesn’t seem to have a huge effect yet, but perhaps they’ll binge on them at the end of semester.

The teaching and learning literature and discourse appears to draw a picture of students as eager to learn, and the only problem is then how good we are as responding to that desire for knowledge and personal growth. However, my experience is this is true for only a small proportion of students, around 10%. The majority are extremely instrumental, and will only find anything ‘engaging’ if there’s something making it engaging, if it’s ‘worth’ something. Perhaps they do find the ideas interesting enough in an abstract sense, but it takes more than that to get them to the next concrete step of doing some intellectual work in engaging with those ideas, so it often feels like an exercise in discipline and regulation. I found Steve Woolgar’s book *Mundane Governance* to be highly relevant for teaching in a university these days.

We hear a lot about teaching excellence and why it’s important to pursue that, but the corollary of teaching excellence is learning excellence, and for many students that’s a bridge too far, because it means more work. There are lots of reasons for that, to do with competing demands on students’ time, stress, anxiety, and so on, but the point is that the road to teaching excellence is a bumpy one.

In relation to the video lectures, I’ve come to the view that this is an inexorable direction we’ll all be moving in sooner or later, for the same sorts of reasons that using email or marking online has become the norm. For units covering core material, which tends to stay pretty similar from one year to the next, there’s an enormous amount of repetition in the lecturing we do. Video lectures have the advantage of being more under the control of the viewer, they can speed it up or slow it down to suit their comprehension of the material. For students who have a long distance to travel, it can make life considerably easier. The technology means that it’s possible to insert quiz questions of various sorts into the lecture, which one can track in Grade Centre! There’s now so much material online in this format – take a look at Alain de Botton’s videos – and things like TED-X Talks have actually transformed the way people experience the presentation of ideas. Granted, there are also people in the live Ted-X audiences, and there’s clearly something about the lecture experience that both students and academics continue to value, which is why one retains a face-to-face lecturing component. But in principle there’s a lot to be gained from converting much of our lecturing material into video lectures.

It’s just that it comes at a rather high cost. Even with $25,000 from the DVCE, for me it’s taken up a huge amount of time. It’s a major transformation of the way we teach, the kind of material we produce for our students and our tutors. I’m a propeller-head, so I’ve enjoyed learning how the video-production process works, but it’s meant I’ve badly neglected my research.

Does it all work any better? I’m not sure, to tell the truth, I’ll see what the students say in the end of year evaluation surveys, and I’ll run some focus groups in 1st semester next year, when things will have been bedded down a bit more. Watch this space, and of course I’d be interested in any other experiences people might have had.
The International Panel on Social Progress

Bringing together the world’s leading social scientists to develop more inclusive and suitable ways for organizing economies and political systems

The International Panel on Social Progress (IPSP) held its first working meeting at Bilgi University, Istanbul, in August 2015. The IPSP aims to bring together some of the world’s leading social scientists to develop research-based, multi-disciplinary, non-partisan solutions to the most pressing social challenges of our time. Its starting point is the idea that humanity has never had such powerful resources to ensure social justice and good living conditions for all, and yet the world is still beset by inequality, deprivation and conflict for billions of people. Science and technology have made massive advances, but this has not led to improvements in security and well-being for all. The use of scientific advances for warfare and profit rather than for enhancing social outcomes now brings the risk of environmental disaster.

The challenge for social scientists is to find more inclusive and sustainable ways of organizing economies, political systems and social orders.

The IPSP is an independent academic initiative, supported by scientific bodies, foundations and universities from around the world. To maintain its independence, it refuses funding from governments, intergovernmental agencies and corporations. The Honorary Advisory Committee is shared by Nobel Prize winner Amartya Sen, who is both a leading economist and a social philosopher. The Scientific Council is chaired by three prominent social scientists: Nancy Fraser, Professor of Political Philosophy and Social Science, at the New School, New York; Ravi Kanbur, Professor of Economics at Cornell

Photo: IPSP
University; and Helge Nowotny, Professor of Social Studies of Science at the Swiss Federation Technical University, Zurich.

The Panel will produce a Report in autumn 2017. Around 230 social scientists representing a wide range of disciplines from around the world have agreed to participate as authors. Prior to the Istanbul meeting, these authors were assigned to working groups preparing each of the Report’s planned 22 chapters. Stephen Castles, of the University of Sydney’s School of Social and Political Sciences, was asked to work on the chapter on ‘New Social Geographies’, which will consider broad issues of globalization, social transformation and human mobility, and how these impact on communities, cultures and individuals. This is the first chapter of the report, and seeks to provide an overview of key changes, to set the scene for more detailed analysis in later sections.

The IPSP Report will not cover all social issues and all social policies, but will focus on the most important issues involving substantial changes and bearing on long run perspectives. The drafting process will include collecting comments from a global network of scholars, civil society, activists, governments, and international organizations. It will deliver a Synthesis report addressed to all social actors, movements, organizations, politicians and decision-makers, in order to provide them with the best expertise on questions that bear on social change.

As one of Australia’s leaders in the social sciences and humanities, the University of Sydney could consider becoming an academic sponsor of the IPSP, along with some of Europe’s and North America’s leading research institutions.

More information on the Panel can be found at:
- http://www.ip-socialprogress.msh-paris.fr/

“humanity has never had such powerful resources to ensure social justice and good living conditions for all, and yet the world is still beset by inequality”

Stephen Castles

Stephen Castles is a Research Professor of Sociology at the University of Sydney and a Research Associate of the International Migration Institute, University of Oxford. He is a sociologist and political economist, and works on international migration dynamics, global governance, migration and development, and regional migration trends in Africa, Asia and Europe. His current research project, Social Transformation and International Migration in the 21st Century, is concerned with the way global forces interact with local factors to shape human mobility.
While others hold up their guns, Sydney Peace Prize recipient George Gittoes holds up his camera to highlight peace and justice.

Written by Chloe Goy

The past few months have been an exciting time for the Sydney Peace Foundation; Ms Juliet Bennett has been named Acting Director, and Ms Katie Pokorney Acting Executive Officer. With the help of the 2015 Sydney Peace Prize recipient, George Gittoes, the Foundation is planning what promises to be one of the most creative Sydney Peace Prize events to date! Perhaps most noteworthy are the electronic advertisements of Gittoes and the Sydney Peace Prize events on main roads, in shopping centres and in cafes across Sydney.

These advertisements display Night Vision 2015, an artwork created by Gittoes in celebration of being awarded the Sydney Peace Prize. Night Vision 2015 is a timely critique of the expanding war on terror and the mass use of technology as an attempt to diminish violence in conflict zones such as Syria and Afghanistan. Gittoes explains his painting is “a warning that military technology is moving us toward the world of Terminator...Night Vision 2015 is about being blind in a technological age to the human suffering caused by war, to people being bombed out of their homes and washed up on beaches.” The Syrian war has demonstrated the issues with the prevailing approach to conflict, which is void of peace with justice and predominantly focuses on forceful coercion into submission to the ways of the West.
Gittoes recommends that we “use art and creativity to confront this blind military madness.” As seen in the Yellow House Jalalabad, it is possible to process trauma, such as war, through the use of art and other prolific channels. The members of the Yellow House have worked with Gittoes to produce creative works which aid in the expression of emotion and thought, as well as constructing educational resources which could be used to help familiarise people across the world with what it is like to experience violence and oppression first hand.

As the world increasingly preferences the latest technology for all aspects of life, Gittoes has chosen to utilise both old and new technology to highlight the plight of people caught in war zones. Through the medium of film and visual arts, he is able to offer help to civilians while also striving to reconcile members of the community with each other and the broader world. The Yellow House is full of people who have drastically different backgrounds and experiences. For example one aspiring actor is a former Taliban sympathiser who works directly with another actor who is a Pakistani soap opera star. This artist collective is a trustworthy place for bringing people together with an overarching purpose of building community through constructive creativity. Through this uniting of peoples, Gittoes demonstrates the uniqueness of his personal convictions. He chose to move away from working only on his personal art and established the Yellow House where he is able to help encourage vulnerable people to express themselves with art and to push for social change within Jalalabad and the wider Afghan community. Gittoes does this with a disregard for his personal safety, acknowledging the importance of fighting for peace with justice in a selfless, proactive and courageous manner.

The Yellow House is intended to be a place where cultural boundaries can be explored, tested and expanded without any threat or oppression. Gittoes believes that the Yellow House is itself an artwork, functioning as a point of reference for new ideas that can remedy old problems. The members of the Yellow House are grateful to be a part of his vision and for the opportunity to create and sell films at the local DVD stalls and on the streets. This is Gittoes’ way of encouraging the people of Jalalabad to own their experiences and to express their resilience to the Taliban’s brutality through peaceful and innovative pathways.

Although his personal work is often perceived as shocking, Gittoes does not want to just startle people. He wants to galvanise people into challenging dominant political thought and behaviour through creative channels. This is why he established the Yellow House, to help inaugurate grassroots momentum and give power to the people directly impacted by the conflict in Afghanistan. Gittoes also aims to encourage people of privilege and other artists to use their resources and skills to contribute to building peace with justice. The artwork featured on our new SPF billboards holds true to this message, as Gittoes himself has said that “Night Vision symbolizes what artists can contribute when they enter the darkness of war to light the way to peace through creativity.”

While others hold up their guns, Gittoes holds up his camera. He chooses to help build up the community rather than risk tearing it down with technological warfare. Witnessing decades of war and violence has helped him come to the realization of how he can, and how we all can, contribute to the achievement of peace with justice. To convey the dark void left in place of once vibrant families and communities, and the crazed efficiency with which automated weaponry bring destruction, Gittoes refers to Night Vision 2015 as a self-portrait that illustrates the complicity of privileged individuals living in countries participating in the war on terror. Nobody living in Australia can escape the culpability and guilt which accompanies living in a nation that is contributing to an unjust war.

The Sydney Peace Prize will be presented to George Gittoes at Sydney Town Hall on Tuesday 10th of November where he will deliver the 2015 City of Sydney Peace Prize Lecture. The Sydney Peace Prize Dinner will directly follow at the Hilton Sydney, from 8pm. We hope you will join us to hear the stories of this extraordinary Australian, and to celebrate peace with justice!
Semester 2, 2015 saw the School continue to publish a wide range of books, book chapters, and journal articles. A selection from each department is featured in this section, taken from a total of 251 publications.
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