

**Jake Lynch**  
**Thursday Aug 18 2011**

An introduction of which any self-respecting journalist would be proud. As Sean says before I became an academic I was a media man, and it was in that guise that I first came to Australia. As it says in your leaflet, I left off my journalistic career as a presenter for BBC World News, and before that I worked as a political correspondent for Sky News. So, the world of journalists can be divided into two parts, those who have worked for Rupert Murdoch, and those who haven't; and I fall into the former group.

But, my first trip to Australia came with another job which I briefly held, which was the Sydney correspondent for The Independent. And one of my first jobs was to write a profile of Pauline Hanson. This was in the lead up to the federal election of 1998, and as you may recall or perhaps may prefer not to recall, her party One Nation had made significant headway in the Queensland state election the previous year. Imagine, I researched thoroughly for this assignment. I immersed myself in that well-known documentary about social morays and vocal political process here in Australia. I refer of course to Muriel's Wedding. Imagine my surprise when these people turned out to be actors. But you might remember that the slogan of the local politico in Muriel's Wedding was *"You Can't Stop Progress"*. And I guess that's true despite the efforts of people like Barnaby Joyce and Bob Katter. Some of the insights which I gained on that trip of course stood me in good stead, as I acclimatized to my new life here. Notably when I came to teach my seven year old son the words to your national song. If I may just venture a little snatch of the melody *"And he sang as he sat and waited while his billy boiled, don't come a seeking asylum with me."* And thereby hangs a tale you see, and it's a tale which I intend to illustrate with reference to some of the ideas which come into my work now as an academic purveyor and still sometimes practitioner of something I call "Peace Journalism". There's a feeling a general sense I think that media these days occupy more central role in our lives. Media is a category which covers a multitude of different forms of course, and one of its areas of influence is over political process. There is a feeling that what we call generative force, that is the capacity to influence the course of events, has migrated or is migrating from the institutional sphere to a communications sphere, instead. You can see it in a thumbnail sketch if you like, in the sense that a generation ago perhaps the significant terms of national debate on particular political questions would be likely to take place

in parliament. Now they are likely to take place in conversations between journalists and spin-doctors before they get raised in parliament. That's just a little indicator of a more general and more widespread phenomenon. And it gives us a clue as to the process of government, and that brings me to the first of the concepts which I want to put out which is that of political spectacle. And it's a way that governments exert social control through the media.

Now in the elections, when Pauline Hanson was standing, in a rather chaotic campaign that she was running at that time, of course it was the water shed really for the Howard Government. John Howard put a program out there and dared people to vote against it. They did vote against it actually in that election more of the two parties preferred vote ended up in Labor's column than that of the coalition but in covering these events I still remember what I was told by somebody. It's a bit like a tennis match. You know you can win a tennis match 7-6 1-6 7-6 1-6 7-6, and you could end up with fewer games won than your opponent, but you've won them in the right place at the right time and that's what John Howard managed to do. And central to his policy platform in that election was the GST. This was a deliberate switch in the pattern of revenue raising from the Australian Government in the direction of the regressive direct taxation, rather than the progressive taxation. And as the months passed after this election, and Mr. Howard and his colleagues introduced their policies, they were greeted with fairly widespread dissatisfaction, fairly widespread dissatisfaction. So much so in fact, that by roughly ten years ago to this day, roughly 2001, the coalition was trailing in the polls. And this remember was only a few months away from the next federal election. So what was John Howard going to do about this? Indeed some of his closest lieutenants had the One Nation Party snapping around their ankles in their electorates, notably that doyen of the Howard battlers, Jackie Kelly, in the federal seat of Lindsay. And it was Jackie Kelly who went to Mr. Howard and used her famous hotline to the office of the cabinet of the Prime Minister to complain that she was in danger of losing her seat to the One Nation Party, and he had to do something about asylum, he had to do something about immigration. This was the card that she wanted to play. And according to Mr. Howard's unauthorized biography by two political academics Peter van Onselen and Wayne Errington, this was the moment when Howard um drew his resolve to make his famous or infamous speech where he declared "*we will decide who comes into Australia, and on what basis they will be admitted.*" And that launched an attempt at this political spectacle. A political spectacle is an orchestrated campaign through the media to distract

people's attention from something else. And that's very important, and it depends on what is called 'psychological distancing'. There must be 'an other' out there somewhere who we don't know. They can not possibly be known to us, because if they were known to us we would, as it were, fill them up with meanings derived from our own experience. They must remain, in academic jargon, an empty signifier, because they must be a vessel, for their hopes, fears, grievances and resentments, which arise from elsewhere and can then be projected onto them by the electorate. So the classic plumber from Sydney's outer west, who declares to media interviewers that he hates boat people, has almost certainly never met any boat people. What he may hate, instead, is the experience of struggling to make ends meet in the context of a society which he is told, from every angle, is becoming ever more affluent. And it is those grievances which are arguably being projected onto the asylum seekers.

So Mr. Howard took into his hands the means to change the agenda, the means to change the conversation around that election, and of course that effort acquired a whole other dimension just weeks later with the 9/11 attacks. So in the remainder of time between then and the next election Mr. Howard and his ministers in all their media statements went out to conflate these two supposed threats to the Australian body politic. People wanting to come into our country might conceivably be, not only asylum seekers, but also terrorists, and indeed it is the case to this day that around about a thousand people who have come to Australia to seek refuge, perhaps successfully established that they face an authentic threat of persecution if they go back to their homeland, but they still cannot take their place in the Australian community. They're still kept under lock and key, because they have not successfully obtained the clearance from ASIO; the security clearance necessary to entitle them to leave detention. So this was these were two mutually reinforcing aspects of a political spectacle that was conjured up by the Howard Government to distract people's attention away from their dissatisfaction over the effects of their own policies, and it was a spectacular success, because the three short months between August and November 2001, they succeeded in turning the political situation around, and obtaining in the end a landslide victory. But the important point not to miss is that that depended on the cooperation, albeit unwittingly in many cases, of the media, the cooperation of people like me, journalists, and one aspect of that cooperation is this. Just think back if you will, over television news for example, that you have watched in recent months. And you might remember stories about the farming industry, for example. And you would have probably

heard from farmers. If you are a fan of Channel Nine News you will probably have heard many stories about the travails of the Rugby Football League and you have probably heard from footy players and footy coaches. But then just think about the stories you've heard about asylum seekers. Where are the asylum seekers, do they ever get a chance to speak for themselves? Think back, when was the last time you saw an asylum seeker, himself or herself, being interviewed in a story about asylum seekers? It's a it's a striking omission, and that's what enables the psychological distancing, which in turn gives the charge to the political spectacle which enables the social control. And in that governments take advantage of some of the widespread conventions of media reporting.

And this is where I must actually, I'm under instructions here, I'm under instructions to promote my book. It's called "*Reporting Conflict - New Directions in Peace Journalism*" and I might digress for a moment to emphasise that the ideas in it are intended not merely to stay within it's pages, but to be influential and to be carried out where appropriate, in the community at large. In that I'm probably, I venture to say, atypical of my colleagues at the University of Sydney. There's one very nice chap I can think of in particular who I won't name. He is the boss of my boss effectively. And you go into his large agreeable office, and in the quadrangle of Sydney Uni, and he writes about democracy, and human rights. And there on a jolly nicely polished coffee table is a stack of books, all by him. And so that's as far as Sydney Uni is concerned is probably where they should stay those publications and I must say that I don't blame the individuals concerned for that. The structure of incentives of our industry is such that that is the kind of outlook which is rewarded. The 'dweebs' at DEEWR - the Department of Education Employment and Workplace Relations are constantly scheming to build up the incentives to us to publish research which is basically going to be read by other academics. There is such a thing as the 'HERDC', which sounds like a patent name for a brand of cattle feed, is instead the Higher Education Research Data Collection and I as the peace guy of the university, I'm keenly aware that we have to keep our record clean when it comes to HERDC, so I'm pleased to report that although we only have three percent of the staff of our school, the school of socio-political sciences, in 2010 we were responsible for fourteen percent of the HERDC points, case therein; so that's the kind of thing that makes us preen ourselves you see. It can testify to the extent to which we speak the language, known only to the well initiated. So these ideas in this book are intended to find wider resonance beyond the merely academic sphere. And they make the case for this thing called Peace Journalism,

essentially as a remedial exercise for the prevalent conventions of media. And when scholars began to think about journalism, when journalism began to be taken seriously in the academy, they were quick off the mark with the image of the gatekeeper. The reporter as the gatekeeper. You know reporters; they'll go through life thinking to themselves "oh we just report the facts." But of course the facts, a category, and practically infinite science, much, much bigger than the reports. Even in these days where the media canvases are depicted as much broader than in former times. So clearly there has to be some criteria to cut them down to size. And the image of the gatekeeper was as the journalist letting some through the gate, and keeping others out. And the ideas of peace journalism originated in an essay by my co-author of this book, a chap called Johan Galtung, who is one of the chief givers of ideas in peace research, where he was the first to provide an account of that process, which established that that doesn't take place at random. The fact that through the gate are always or usually the same kind of facts, and therefore the facts that get shut out are also usually the same kind of facts. And when it comes to reporting politics it is very noticeable, more or less around the world, that journalism is very likely to bring you the rival views of the two parties which contest government. It is very unlikely to juxtapose those views with the views of anyone else. Something which is arguably exacerbated by what I think of as the Canberra affect, Canberra affect. One of your colleagues mentioned to me that he'd had an interesting conversation, with a waitress in a Canberra restaurant, and of course it's a little bit like Hollywood, you know no one's just a waitress in Hollywood, they're all about to be actors, and no one's just a waitress in Canberra, they're all about to enter some kind of, you know, sort of glorious career. And sure enough at her start of this career she was intending to study at the Centre of Economic Studies, which I highly recommend. The Canberra affect though is such that there are no ordinary people in Canberra. When I was a political correspondent in London I remember when the new Labor government brought in the minimum wage. And we only had to walk ten minutes from our office, with our camera gear over our shoulders, to talk to a road sweeper, a hairdresser, and someone working in a cafe, all of whom would directly benefit from the minimum wage. When there was a development in stories about asylum seekers in the UK, where the issue achieved similar proportions to the way it sometimes does here, it was not easy but it was certainly possible, to bring an asylum seeker into the studio to speak for himself, or if you couldn't do that you could go out into one of the communities in London, and find somebody to interview, so in a sense London is a city such that all life is there. So you could ameliorate this affect, as a political correspondent with a mind to be inclined to, it's probably

much more difficult to do that in Canberra, and that shows I think in the character of the Canberra coverage coming through to us over the various ..... But that is one prevalent reporting convention.

Another reporting convention is to present conflicts, conflicts of any kind, including political conflicts, in dyadic form. And there are good reasons for this. It safeguards our interests as journalists. You know I was employed for a long while in public service broadcasting, and in the BBC we were not allowed to have opinions. And so we had to insulate ourselves against possible charges of bias. The easiest way to do that is to prove that you haven't been one-sided by hearing both sides. You soon realise that more or less every story could be boiled down to a fairly reliable formula. On the one hand, on the other hand, in the end time will tell. And once you once you grasp this you must then prepare for a successful career. The problem with that in mapping in presenting conflict in that way, you exert an influence on them. And remember my opening remarks, that increasingly the attitudes and behaviors of people involved in the news are immersed and saturated with the logic of media. Parties to conflict large and small consider how they are likely to be reported, how the reporting is likely to rebound on them and further their interests, as they decide what to do, as they decide what to say. So the logic of media representation seeps in to the people's responses. Now if I have a conflict which I begin to concede as consisting of only two parties, on the one hand, on the other hand, that may unfortunately may be a recipe to escalate it. Now I think it's a reasonable supposition that there are people here this evening who are, shall we say, of seniority such that you probably studied Geometry at school. So you may recall therefore that two points can only be joined in one way by a line, by a line that's right. So if I imagine that my journalistic colleague there is the other party, I throw you a rope, here we have a line. OK, now we're against each other. If I gain a meter, what happens to him? He'll lose a meter; it's a zero sum gain. Ultimately we face only two options, victory or defeat. So any development, any shift in the relations between us, if it is not unambiguously winning for me, I risk that being reported as losing.

And spare a thought for poor David Cameron, for example, or Nikolas Sarkozy at the moment. They've been in the lead in responding to UN Security Council Resolution 1973, mandating the protection of civilians in Libya, and in pursuit of that they've ordered their air forces to impose a no-fly zone, that's one of the provisions of the resolution, and it's probably the one most of us know. I wonder how many of us actually recall that the other provisions of that

resolution were for all sides to move as quickly as possible to a cease-fire, and engage in dialogue. And they've been rather forgotten in this instead of which David Cameron need only consult the morning newspapers in London, any day of the week, to learn that dialogue and cease-fire would represent backsliding. And if Colonel Gaddafi emerges from this encounter still in power, even over a piece of Libya, David Cameron will have no one to blame but himself. This is the kind of rhetoric that comes through. To quote from the London Daily Telegraph, in pursuit of its famous motto, "all we are saying is give war a chance." But you begin to get the idea that when conflict become immersed in the logic of media, they take on that escalatory character. So these are widespread conventions in journalism, and they have some unintentional extra-linear, but arguably malign affects. They may prepare the ground for political spectacles to become dumped as a means of social control, which is bad news for the person on the other side, the asylum seekers in that case. They may indeed cause parties to conflict to compare notes with each other, and think for themselves "oh crikey we'd better escalate this and get to a swift conclusion, otherwise we will risk being seen as the loser." And if you're going to escalate than you may need to justify it, and so your statements start to take on a harder edge, and you start to anoint the person on the other end of the rope not merely as that, but as the evil one. That's where you get this mysterious female that President George W. Bush used to refer to *Evelyn Tent*. Apparently a threat to what he called America's fundamental interests but those days are gone.

But these are some prevalent conventions of media, and they give rise to a dominant form of war journalism, and it's because they may observe these affects, albeit unwittingly, that that term is merited. And so the peace journalism is supposed to be a remedy for that.

Now I, as I say, I try my best not merely to confine my activities to writing about peace journalism, but try to continue to actually carry it out. And I've done been doing so recently in a domain which I know is of concern to many here, namely the Israel Palestine conflict. And I acted as a kind of a media advisor unpaid I must hasten to add, to the Australians who courageously joined the freedom flotilla to try to challenge Israel's illegal blockade of Gaza. And that was a very interesting experience, because what I was trying to do there was to apply yet another of these academic concepts and in this case it's something drawn from a field called Social Movement, the Social Movement Theory. And this particular concept is called Frame Alignment. Now that sounds like something the guy in the picture shop does on the

corner, but it actually means that you slice and dice your message in such a way as to resonate with ideas that people all ready approve of. And that's a bit of a tough sell for people in this activism over the freedom flotilla. Because first of all there's the ongoing media assumption cherished by *ABC Lateline* for example, that any meaningful political initiative must of course emanate from the front bench of either the Labor Party or the Coalition.

And so to pop up, as it were, with your own political initiative from outside that charmed circle, is all ready to put yourself at a disadvantage. Indeed it may be to risk being labeled as deviant. There's a very interesting writer called Daniel Hallin who wrote a book about the Vietnam War, the way it was covered in the United States, called *The Uncensored War*. And what he proposed was that there are some ideas which journalism generally takes as a matter of consensus. For example if an election is called journalists don't generally feel constrained to go out and canvas opinions from people who think there shouldn't be an election. Those are the types of people who'll be deviant, OK. So that can be taken as a given. Most journalistic activity takes place he said in the zone in the middle, which he called the zone of Legitimate Controversy, Legitimate Controversy. And his he made his reputation by tracing the process by which opposition to the war in Vietnam migrated from the zone of deviancy to the zone of legitimate controversy, and it's a very interesting thesis.

But in this case there are repeated attempts by a lot of obvious suspects to confine civil society activism over the Israel Palestine conflict, in particular the brand of civil society activism which takes international law and human rights as it's touchstone, to confine and consign that to a zone of deviancy. Never more evident in the sustained blast which emanated from Murdoch Towers in the period just after the NSW state election, just a few months ago, over more than a fortnight two or three weeks to demonise exponents, like me, of the boycott, divestments and sanctions campaign. Now that was quite interesting because I kept up a little kind of informal research study on this, I actually bought the Australian every day, which I have to have a higher purpose to do, I'll tell you, and I noticed that in this avalanche of verbiage, you know as day after day went by, it was impressively sustained for a good four, five, six articles per day, often quite meaty ones, you know at or near the page lead, there was one word that was conspicuous by it's absence. The word was "occupation". In other words the single most salient fact about the conflict was not only missing, but actually completely obscured. It was completely marginalised. So the key to any discussion which places international law

and human rights at the centre of consideration of the issues, in that conflict was being completely obscured in the coverage of it by the Australian. So therefore that's another layer of demonisation, another attempt, another grounds on which such activism is attempted to be confined to this sort of deviance. And there are academics indeed some of whom I have taken on in columns in public prints, who go around with striking frankness in saying that the only legitimate debate we should be having here is over when the Americans are going to successfully broker a two state solution. These people with their beady etches should just quieten down and go away.

One of the people whom The Australian consulted on this was Kevin Rudd. I was encouraged to hear that Kevin Rudd was advocating for Australians to vote in favour of the motion for Palestine Statehood. On this occasion Kevin Rudd ventured the opinion that boycott, divestments and sanctions was, as he put it, a foreign policy made by pre-schoolers. Now the reason I'm encouraged is this. That as the father of a seven year old boy it's been my privilege to witness the pre-school stage of development. And that's the stage where we begin to connect cause and effect. Now Kevin Rudd is notionally an advocate of the two state solution. So I was wondering, what's he going to do to bring it about? If it's not ??? what's it going to be? Now his suggestion that Australia back the resolution in the general assembly may supply the answer. For that moment I was not clear what the means was going to be to bring about this supposedly desired effect, so I thought Kevin Rudd was probably an advocate of a pre-pre-school foreign policy. But anyway against this unpropitious backdrop, what we did was to set out to try to use the initiative shown by these Australians joining the flotilla, to try and transform the picture, to try to drag this point of view back out of the zone of deviancy, and place it instead in the legitimately controversial, where it could be taken seriously in the media. And to that end we tried to do some kind of fairly cunning positioning. So one of them, for example, discovered in a letter to DEFAT, Kevin Rudd's ministry, that Australia had waived it's carefully and valuable won rights under the Vienna Convention, to give consular assistance to any of it's nationals who are taken into custody overseas. So there had been a secret meeting with Israel, which DEFAT had not announced, which they shamefacedly admitted in this letter would lead to Australians who are taken into custody being denied consular assistance. So we used that to say actually DEFAT is letting the side down here. You know DEFAT is not playing games, are you getting a rather familiar feeling of how we are trying to enter resonate the values held dear by the Australian community at large. These were ordinary Australians who were acting out of simple humanitarian mateship, to help people who'd been

denied a fair go. Clichés I know, but they began to prove affective. So they were interviewed on the George Negus Program on Channel Ten. My local newspaper, the Inner West Courier, had a picture on it's front page of one of these people, Michael Coleman, in a kayak attempting to stop the coast guard from preventing them from setting out from Crete and a kind of picture story on him on the inside pages, the fact that having started my life as a cub reporter in local media I can tell you that's a bog standard story for local newspapers; local person does something interesting. But that's an issue in this context, that's legitimate in this context that we have successfully moved them back from the people who were going to be a threat, and exponents of this deviant point of view back into the realm of people who instead should be regarded as cuddly, friendly types, who would just kind of act on a humanitarian impulse. So that was an interesting context in which to view that work.

Another one concerned Australia's extraordinary adherence to it's military. And what I want to suggest to you and to tell you a little bit about the work that we are planning to do, over the next few years in the Centre and in the Sydney Peace Foundation, is to try to take on what has become apparent to me is a kind of fairly elaborate conspiracy to try to convince Australians that we should regard our national identity as being synonymous with episodes of our military history. The military escapades. I was first alerted to this when I had to do a question and answer session with a chap called Robin Gerster, a historian who'd written an award-winning book, and it was organised by the NSW Historical Society. And both this chap Robin, who was a historian, and the people in the society told me, that this ended last year, that they were all ready being approached by people in Canberra to supply fresh ideas to commemorate the centenary of the outbreak of the First World War, and the centenary of ANZAC of the battle of Gallipoli. And around that same time, Gerard Henderson popped up with a column in the Sydney Morning Herald, which I thought was slightly odd at the time, but in content maybe less a coincidence than it might at first seem whereby he was trying to argue that our conventional view of the First World War was actually mistaken. That it was not a kind of grievous waste of enormous numbers of human lives in an essentially futile cause, but actually strategically terribly sensible. And that we should look back with pride on our part in this place in history, and so I thought so here we are, here's the beginning of this kind of revisionist version which will no doubt obtain wider currency as we lead up to it, and it's a large fact that, again I invite you to cast your mind back over your media experience, personal viewing and reading experience, and just think when

was the last time you heard on the radio, or saw on television, for example, anybody advocating a reduction in Australia's defence expenditure? When was the last time you saw or heard anybody advocating that Australian troops should pull out of Afghanistan? These are extremely rare occurrences and yet the oddity is that the perspective that we should pull our troops out of Afghanistan, and the view that we should reduce our defence spending, is according to some opinion polls, the view of large numbers, even the majority, of the Australian public.

So there is an obvious disconnect between media and main public opinion. That by the way is a situation that makes journalists uneasy, as it should. There's a media academic called Michael Schutzen who came up with a classic mouthful which is this, and I'll try and render it in academise to give you the benefit; "the media are formerly disconnected from other ruling agencies for they must attend as much to their own legitimation as to the legitimation of the capitalist system as a whole". What it means is that media can ill afford to appear more credulous, or less well informed than their audience. There's an understandable unease around these situations and of course we try to push this, and one of the interesting episodes was when the ABC, so I'm not picking on the ABC but the ABC's PM Program, had a report on an episode of the government setting out how it was going to procure all the military hardware to make good on all these whiz-bang plans it had brought in to upgrade Australia's military capacity. And the two speakers in this package, were the minister John Faulkner and the Deputy Greg Combet. And in vain did I wait for any kind view by way of balance, and of course they both advocate the same point of view. There wasn't even anybody from the opposition in this, so I rang up the ABC and I said "look, what's going on?", and they said "OK well put in a complaint then" so I did. And in the complaint I raised the same question I just raised to you, "when was the last time we heard from anybody advocating the opposite point of view that Australia's defence menu should be reduced?" And I got a response from a classic protocol droid from their Audience and Communications Department, directing my attention to a series of about twelve links to the transcripts of other programs, where other people had been interviewed. The first one was to an interview which it appeared the following morning, Kim Beazley, the former Labor Defence Minister, so I clicked on the link and saw what Mr Beazley had to say, the first thing he said was "the two men I envy most in Australia are Minister Faulkner and Defence Minister Combet." So this was by way of balance. The next one was an interview with Brendan Nelson, remember him, yeh just about. Of course he'd been the Defence Minister in

the previous government. He obligingly explained that “plans formed by this government are just a continuation of the same ones that we had.” So clearly there was no real kind of opposition there. So that was an interesting one to draw attention to. But the two I believe are linked. We are being increasingly addressed as though we should regard Australia’s, key moments of Australia’s identity of having been formed on the battlefield. But nothing of note happened before 1915. Of course we set it free. I mean that was one thing that should be noted. But apart from that apparently it’s time to remind ourselves that Australia pioneered democracy and trade union rights long before the First World War came as a blot on the horizon.

So there is ample reason to want to contest this version of history, and not coincidental that is the push now, at the self same time that Australia is wanting to seriously upgrade it’s amount of military hardware. Pride of place is taken by a planned order of as many as one hundred of the F35 Fighter Plane from the United States. At some fabulous cost, you know well into the tens of billions of dollars. Serious money. Does anybody happen to know what the combat range of the F35 Fighter Plane is? It’s 1025 kilometers. That’s how far it can go before refueling, it has to be bought back to refuel . So it’s just about going to enable us to attack Melbourne, but nowhere nearer regions of Indonesia and New Guinea, so unless there are any plans to invade them seriously, but the mystery is slightly with the statement by Minister Faulkner announcing this order, that it will enable Australia to join in future coalition operations. A rather ominous turn of phrase which is obviously presaging the fact that Australia sees itself as part of what is a seriously escalating arms race, in our quadrant of the globe. Here is America, building a new base at Jeju Island in South Korea, spending 8 billion dollars upgrading its military base on Guam, another 6 billion dollars of military hardware to Taiwan. Here is China on the other hand upgrading it’s own military facilities, launching it’s first aircraft carrier. We’ve got to put down our sword and come out and shake hands, and that’s something which we in the Sydney Peace Foundation will be emphasising as these centenaries approach. And we will be saying that we need to excavate these hidden meanings, which are in danger of being obscured beneath these kind of media supplied bigger loads of material, which can fall on top of them. Something more of the spirit of “And the Band Played Waltzing Matilda” and so on, more of the spirit of “Never Again”, and how can we as a community find resources to ensure that that is indeed the case.

**So in that respect just let me do my other duty and alert you to the opportunity to become a friend of the Sydney Peace Foundation as you'll find on the table in front of you, but it's been great to be among friends, thank you very much for listening, I look forward to your company.**