

## **THE CENTRE FOR PEACE AND CONFLICT STUDIES**

### **UNIVERSITY OF SYDNEY**

#### **CPACS OBJECTIVES**

The Centre for Peace and Conflict Studies was established in May 1988 as a specialist research and teaching centre within the University of Sydney. It has evolved into a significant international contributor in this field.

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

It promotes interdisciplinary research, teaching, public discussion and publication on the causes of conflict and the conditions which affect conflict resolution and peace. Through the Peace Foundation and the Sydney Peace Prize it celebrates the achievements of outstanding contributors to the processes that build peace, justice, truth and reconciliation.

Projects focus on the concept and realities of justice and the means of attaining conditions which contribute to equitable social relationships and just societies.

#### **THE CONTEXT OF THE 2000 REPORT**

##### **Peace with Justice**

As a prologue to an account of CPACS activities the Annual Report has always provided a brief sketch of national and international affairs which have a bearing on our objective of peace with justice. This sketch deals with matters such as the current struggles to achieve peace in various areas of the world, the progress of moves for reconciliation with indigenous peoples, the issue of abuse of human rights, and the impact of global economic developments and government policies on the provision of education and welfare and the general conditions of life and work.

## The Middle East

In the last twelve months the Middle East has gone from bad to worse. By December the rock-throwing and sniping of the new al-Aqsa *intifada* had escalated into Palestinian attacks on Jewish settlements and settlers and the Israeli response resorted to helicopter gunship bombardment of Arafat's Preventive Security Chief's offices. Outgoing American President Clinton, before handing over to George W. Bush on 20 January, attempted to lay out the framework of a comprehensive settlement and persuade Israeli Prime Minister Ehud Barak and Palestinian leader Yasser Arafat not to miss this historic 'golden opportunity'. But they did; although enormous concessions were offered on both sides, the issue of Jerusalem was insurmountable. Despite his part in Israel's disastrous war in Lebanon, his support for West Bank settlements and his inflammatory visit to the Temple Mount the previous September and the resulting *intifada* (or perhaps because of them), Ariel Sharon presented himself to the Israeli voters as a potential peacemaker, and won the mid-February prime-ministerial elections in a landslide. Significantly, the one million Arab citizens mostly boycotted the elections. It took some weeks to assemble a workable but inherently unstable 'national unity government', ranging from fundamentalist religious minorities to Foreign Minister Shimon Peres, who shared a Nobel Peace Prize with Arafat for the Oslo Peace Accords. Nonetheless, Sharon was clearly in charge, making stringent demands on the Palestinians as a precondition to resumed negotiations. The peace process shaped at Oslo was over.

Unfortunately, the rhetoric of accusation and counter-accusation, threat and counter-threat produced the escalation risked by both sides. By April Sharon had authorised a new phase of military retaliation, involving strikes by tanks or missile-firing helicopters on Palestinian Authority security bases and forces and Arafat's personal bodyguards. Palestinian terrorist groups such as Hamas, Hezbollah and Islamic Jihad responded with sniper fire, mortar attacks and suicide bombings. A 'near war' developed as Israeli forces invaded towns in the conceded territories, conducted search and destroy operations, and clamped down on border crossings and economic activity. Demands that Arafat impose a complete cessation of violence against Israel ignored both the lack of political motivation and the lack of real Palestinian Authority control. The suicide bombing of a Tel Aviv nightclub in June by Islamic Jihad and 'targeted strikes' by Israel against suspected terrorist opponents, in their cars, offices and homes, ushered in a summer of violence. Terrorist attacks by Jewish settlers against Palestinian neighbours and vice versa heightened the hatreds. The pressures of endless *intifada* and anger at the powerlessness and corruption of the Palestinian Authority and the ruthlessness and violence of Israeli occupation, fragmented and hardened the Palestinian people. Incident after incident on both sides – murders, assassinations, bombings, military strikes, destruction of property – killing children and women as well as men, strengthened the extremists at the expense of the few remaining peacemakers.

The very debate about the morality of Israeli assassination of opponents illustrates the dilemma. Those who justify it see it not as terrorism but as legitimate military self-defence, notwithstanding the incidental deaths of others. Unfortunately, there is truth in what Sharon told American Secretary of State Colin Powell, when America protested against this strategy: 'What we did in Nablus was the same thing you would have done to protect American citizens.' Those who oppose it see it as murderous revenge, as callous and above all, counter-productive. Eminent Israeli writer David Grossman made the point in September: 'Violence will not bring peace, only more violence. Killing influential leaders will not eliminate their beliefs or support of their ideas. It will do the opposite.' Prophetic words. The escalation of international terrorism on September 11 has made the peaceful resolution of the Arab-Israeli conflict even more difficult. Sharon has labeled all his opponents 'terrorists', including Arafat, and resisted American pressure to facilitate the creation of a global alliance against terrorism by defusing the Middle eastern conflict. Brief moments of 'cease-fire' come and go. Arafat has shown little inclination for constructive proposals and may lack both the necessary control and inclination. Neither leader shows much leadership. When in October Colin Powell and later George Bush made sensible supportive references to 'the idea of a Palestinian state', a furious Sharon responded with an historical allusion to the outbreak of the Second World War: 'Do not try to appease the Arabs at our expense. Israel will not be Czechoslovakia.' But who fits what historical role may not be that simple. Those who fail to learn from history are doomed to repeat it.

The latest US mission to help end the fourteen months of violence, led by the Assistant Secretary of State, William Burns, arrived in late November in the shadow of even greater violence. Despite rising international concern, the mutual accusations of 'aggression' and 'terrorism' reveal no willingness to compromise. By then, the death toll in this phase of conflict had reached at least 720 Palestinians and 189 Israelis. It can only be hoped that where vision and leadership have failed, international concern and the voice of the people can prevail.

### **Northern Ireland**

The 'Good Friday Agreement' of Easter 1998, which finally came into operation in November 1999, still provides the framework for a power-sharing administration in Northern Ireland, but real progress is limited. The issues of decommissioning of IRA weapons, creation of an independent police force and British military withdrawal are intertwined, and generate more promises than results, allowing the extremists to reassert themselves. First Minister David Trimble has struggled against obstruction from both his own Ulster Unionist Party and Sinn Fein, the political front of the Irish Republican Army. In March British Prime Minister Blair and Irish Prime Minister Ahern met at Hillsborough Castle, near Belfast, keeping the process alive but achieving little. The first of a new series of bombings, carried out by IRA dissidents, went off outside the BBC Television Centre in west London in early March. The British elections returned Tony Blair's Government to power

but did not alter the Irish situation much. By the middle of summer Trimble's own party was refusing to participate in the Belfast Government, and his own leadership was in jeopardy.

Everyone was given a jolt, however, with the arrest in Colombia in August of three Irish extremists, suspected of being members of a breakaway faction, the Provisional IRA, but also having ties with Sinn Fein, who appear to have been training local guerillas in return for money and weapons. Shortly after, the depths of bigotry were revealed by the Protestant abuse and violence against Catholic schoolchildren who passed through their neighbourhood to reach their school, and the stoning of a Protestant school bus and killing of a Protestant teenager by a Catholic motorist. Each side blamed the other for provocation. The political process almost derailed when in November the Ulster Unionist Party withdrew their support from Trimble as leader, but after subsequent manipulation and persuasion restored it. Unfortunately, the power-sharing arrangement entrenches the sectarian and political divisions of Northern Ireland, and encourages extremists. The bombings continue, and the IRA has made another of its equivocal promises on decommissioning. What was written a year ago still stands: the process at least survives, and has so far withstood the strain of violence by extremists on both sides.

### **The Balkans**

The consequences of the unwillingness of KFOR, the NATO-dominated Peacekeeping Force, to deal decisively with the Kosovo Liberation Army from the outset, and provide security for all ethnic groups in Kosovo, have begun to destabilise neighbouring regions. First, a new Albanian rebel group began operations to 'liberate' the Albanians in the Presovo Valley, a part of Serbia in the 5-kilometre-wide neutral buffer zone around the northern and eastern border of Albania. Their campaign of terror began with small arms and mortar attacks on Serbian police and military outside the zone, and by February had escalated to the remote-controlled bombing of a local bus, killing Serb civilians. Anger from Belgrade and condemnation from Western peacekeepers achieved little, although continuation of the campaign led KFOR finally to permit a limited Serbian military presence for self-defence. Before then, however, Macedonian officials to the south-east claimed that rebels wearing former KLA uniforms were using Macedonia to launch attacks into Serbia. By April these Albanian 'rebels', calling themselves the National Liberation Army, were attacking police posts inside Macedonia, posing a critical dilemma for the joint Slav and Albanian Government of Macedonia. Macedonian leaders from both ethnic groups were angry at the West for permitting the destabilisation of their once-successful multi-ethnic government, which jointly represented the country's 60% Macedonian Slav and 33% ethnic Albanian populations. But the NLA's military campaign spread in the west and their political demands for even more power for Albanians created a crisis. Even the creation of a new 'national unity' coalition government, made up of representatives of every major ethnically-based political party in the country, and plenty of advice from the West to offer more concessions, failed to curb the fragmentation of control.

Urban rioting and violence increased the stakes. The attempt both to introduce radical reforms and mount a military resistance had only permitted the NLA to advance to within mortar range of Skopje airport by June. European Union and NATO leaders put further pressure on Macedonian leaders to achieve a political solution, without offering any military support. But former American ambassadors to the United Nations, Richard Holbrooke and Jeane Kirkpatrick, issued a blunt statement: 'NATO needs to make it clear ... that it will not allow Macedonia to be destroyed.' By late August NATO had reluctantly initiated Operation Essential Harvest, in which a 4,500 strong task force would enter Macedonia, if the situation appeared safe, for the specific task of collecting voluntarily surrendered NLA weapons, in order to create a new climate of mutual trust. Despite estimates of as many as 100,000 weapons in rebel hands, and the ready availability of more from Kosovo, NATO announced its willingness to accept a few thousand weapons as an act of good faith. The process has commenced, amidst pessimism all round, and the background to the September 11 terrorist attacks on America might well reinforce the lesson that those who sup with short spoons with terrorists have a lot to learn.

One significant development in the Balkans, however, was the arrest in Belgrade in April of former Yugoslav President Slobodan Milosevic. In June he was extradited to the Hague to appear before the UN War Crimes Tribunal on charges of multiple atrocities in Croatia in 1991-2 and Kosovo in 1999. In late November a further lengthy charge sheet indicted him for another 29 offences, committed in Bosnia against Bosnian Muslims and Croats between 1992 and 1995, including genocide, complicity to commit genocide and grave breaches of the Geneva Convention. The UN defines genocide as 'acts committed with intent to destroy, in whole or in part, a national, ethnical, racial or religious group.' The charges relate to 'ethnic cleansing' by murder, torture, sexual abuse and incarceration, particularly at Srebrenica, a supposed UN safe haven, in 1995, and to the murder of civilians during the siege of Sarajevo. More such war crimes trials need to be held and publicised, and the message needs to be clear that the international conventions on war crimes apply to all, both 'winners' as well as 'losers.'

## **Zimbabwe**

Robert Mugabe, the African nationalist leader who became President of post-colonial Zimbabwe in 1980, has consistently flouted the rule of law and respect for human rights. Military violence against tribal opponents in the early years gave way to waste, inflation, unemployment, corruption and personal aggrandisement. In 1997 Mugabe created a weapon of intimidation and violence by commencing the payment of large gratuities and pensions to 'war veterans' who had fought for him in the liberation struggle. He also ignited an explosive issue by announcing that white-owned farms, one of the few efficient areas of the economy, would be expropriated by the state without compensation. Despite a rising opposition at parliamentary elections, brief resistance to growing

illegalities from the judiciary and pleas from other African and international leaders, Mugabe continues to condone violence against both white and black opponents in an effort to win the 2002 Presidential elections. Policies to right wrongs dating from colonial times have some justification; the methods being used have none, and will do irreparable damage.

## **East Timor**

The world's newest nation entered the new millennium with an enormous task ahead, created by the legacies of centuries of Portuguese colonisation, 25 years of Indonesian rule, and a violent and destructive road to independence. But with international financial and agency assistance and local effort, a major programme of reconstruction has commenced. Postal services, public services, banks courts, schools and a university are operating. Public buildings have been rebuilt in Dili, new ministries have been created, a security force is being trained and general economic activity is increasing. But there are large unmet demands for training and resources, and conditions in rural East Timor are variable and difficult. Many people have left the country for the city, but unemployment is high, and jealousy and resentment of UN and NGO foreign and local employees is mounting. Despite the presence of UN peacekeepers, there are still security problems with rogue militia, and about 80,000 East Timorese still live in squalor and danger in West Timorese camps. Nonetheless, the UN Transitional Administration is preparing for departure, following the election of an 88-member Constituent Assembly on August 30 this year.

Despite being enthusiastically contested by 16 official parties and a host of independent candidates, the campaign and elections were virtually trouble-free. The Assembly is charged with writing a constitution within three months and shaping the new political system. Support for Xanana Gusmao, a charismatic but reluctant candidate for the office of President, was overwhelming. His leadership will be invaluable. As the transitional bodies, the UNHCR, the NGOs, the health and training and development agencies withdraw, the transition will become very difficult. Some problems stand out. Cases of human rights abuses, arising in particular from the massacre in the Catholic Church at Liquica in April 1999, are under indictment before both UN prosecutors and the Indonesian Attorney-Genera's office. The problem of returnees remains. On November 26, under heavy security guard, President Gusmao made a reconciliation trip to the West Timorese capital, Kupang. In short, a lot has been done; more remains. But the framework for a remarkable creative achievement is in place.

## **The Pacific**

FIJI: The collapse of George Speight's coup in mid-2000, the setting up of the National Council for Reconciliation and Liberty, and the formation of an interim government headed by Laisenia Qarase

left Fiji in a quiet but unstable situation. Divisions between the Indian and ethnic Fijian communities had been sharpened by the coup, and still dominated economic development and government policy. George Speight's trial for treason bogged down in legalities. The elections of late August this year were peaceful but inconclusive, giving both Qarase and former Prime Minister Mahendra Chaudry sufficient support to take office. George Speight, though in gaol, won a seat. Although Qarase refused to honour the constitutional requirement to create a unity government reflecting the strength of the parties, by including Chaudry, the situation remains stable though strained. Restraint all round, economic recovery and even-handed political treatment would promote further reconciliation.

**THE SOLOMONS:** In the Solomons, the Townsville Peace Agreement, signed in October 2000, provided for the disbanding of both the Malaita Eagle Force and the Isatabu Freedom Movement, and the establishment of a Peace Monitoring Council, aided by an International Peace Monitoring Team, to promote reconciliation and arrange the agreed surrender of weapons. But the weapons were not forthcoming, and the absence of proper policing has permitted bands of armed criminals to roam unchecked. The economy has further deteriorated, unemployment is rampant, accusations of corruption abound, and the ethnic animosities between the people of Malaita and Guadalcanal generated by the civil war run deep.

**BOUGAINVILLE:** Positive progress is slowly being made towards an autonomous government for Bougainville and resolution of the issues of weapons surrender and the terms and timing of a referendum. A Bougainville Peace Agreement has been before the Papua-New Guinea Parliament since August. Both Prime Minister Sir Mekere Morauta and leaders of the Bougainville Peoples Congress have supported the legislation. Not all Bougainville leaders and ex-combatants have supported the process, however, and the implementation of an arms disposal plan to collect, containerise and guard all weapons is crucial. Moreover, Papua-New Guinea has problems itself. The Government has to cope with high youth unemployment, urban crime and violence, the spread of disease (particularly HIV-AIDS), the resurgence of rural payback and witchcraft killings, and a political system hampered by nepotism and corruption based on regional and tribal loyalties. Involvement in Australia's 'Pacific solution' to its refugee policies proved divisive.

### **The War on Terrorism**

The terrorist attacks in America on September 11 shook the whole world. Repeated images of planes crashing into office towers and exploding, of people plunging to their deaths, of buildings collapsing into heaps of rubble, people fleeing advancing storms of debris and the stories of victims from all over the world, made this the largest and most visible act of terror in history. Universal horror and outrage and condemnation were understandable and justified. Unfortunately, there was also the danger that these reactions could lead to hasty political decisions which might not only

make the task of understanding and fighting terrorism more difficult but might further the cause of the terrorists. In the widely distributed September 11 Special Edition of *Time*, Lance Morrow called for 'rage and retribution', for 'focused brutality', 'hatred' and 'fury' and a ruthless war between the 'civilised' and the 'uncivilised'. He made no reference to victims other than Americans, to justice or selectivity or proportionate response, to the United Nations or any of its agencies, or the dangers of following the line that the end justifies the means. Other commentators talked of 'a new breed of terrorists' and speculated on the possible use of 'new weapons of terror', such as biological, chemical or nuclear weapons. The tension was heightened by a series of anthrax attacks through the mail, which has killed five people and infected thirteen others. Although the strain of anthrax used has been identified as Ames, named after the location of the federal laboratory in Iowa which first isolated it after a local case, its distribution is proving difficult to unravel and the identity and purpose of whoever has unleashed it are unknown. Informed speculation holds that this is another case of domestic terrorism, although there are also attempts to link Saddam Hussein and Iraq to the case.

Terrorism is not new. Its history shows that extremists come from all religions and walks of life, that available technology and weaponry were always utilised to terrorise, that states could use terror as well as individuals and organisations, and that terrorism was usually overcome only when the circumstances which bred and nourished it altered. Not surprisingly, however, President Bush set the tone when he announced an 'international war on terrorism' in his speech to Congress ten days after the attack. He presented the issue as 'good' versus 'evil', portrayed the terrorists as thugs and criminals – 'Al-Qa'ida is to terror what the Mafia is to crime.' – and linked them to 'the murderous ideologies' of the past: 'they follow the path of fascism, and Nazism, and totalitarianism.' He linked Osama bin Laden and his network to previous bombings, of American embassies in Tanzania and Kenya and the USS *Cole*. He distinguished between 'a fringe form of Islamic extremism' and the rest of the Muslim world. The issue was simple: 'Freedom and fear are at war.' The goal was clear: 'Whether we bring our enemies to justice, or bring justice to our enemies, justice will be done.' The warning was plain: 'either you are with us, or you are with the terrorists.' Demands were made on the Taliban regime which were clearly unlikely to be acceptable. War in Afghanistan was intended. Only the diplomatic initiatives to create an American led international coalition and the military preparation remained. The code name 'Infinite Justice' soon gave way to something more realistic, and Bush was joined enthusiastically by British Prime Minister Tony Blair and Australian Prime Minister John Howard. Only Kofi Annan, UN Secretary General, while acknowledging America's right to respond, argued for targeted and measured actions, awareness of the moral dimension and the plight of innocent victims, and the need to use the whole episode as a starting point for a new humanitarianism.

Unfortunately, in their zeal to pursue possible opponents, the American Government has seriously undermined the very respect for human rights and the rule of law on which it bases the claim to be

the leader of the free world. Presidential executive orders have permitted the questioning of recently arrived Middle Eastern men, the detention without charge of mostly unidentified immigrants, eavesdropping on privileged attorney-client communications, and the secret trial of suspected foreign terrorists by special military tribunals, convened anywhere in the world and using procedures which sharply reduce the usual legal safeguards. Attorney General John Ashcroft endorsed these orders with the comment: 'Foreign terrorists who commit war crimes against the United States, in my judgment, are not entitled to and do not deserve the protection of the American Constitution.' Critics pointed to the hypocrisy of defending a way of life by abandoning values basic to that way of life. The American Civil Liberties Union criticised the Bush Administration for 'increasingly appearing willing to circumvent the Bill of Rights'. But America is not alone. In Britain, Blair has introduced legislation to permit detention without trial and other curbs on civil liberties, harking back to the discredited policies used against the IRA decades earlier. In Australia the Attorney General argues that new powers are needed to help the Australian Security and Intelligence Organisation fight terrorism. It is proposed to permit the detention of suspects for 48 hours without charging them and interrogation without access to a lawyer. ASIO is exempt from the Freedom of Information Act, and if people appeal to the Administrative Appeals Tribunal against their treatment, ASIO agents are already allowed to give evidence in secret.

## **Afghanistan**

Afghanistan's fiercely independent ethnic and tribal groups have frequently fought one another and, when necessary, temporarily united against foreign invaders. Already one of the most landmine-littered countries in the world, a legacy of the last 22 years of savage warfare, with a literacy rate of about 25%, almost a third of its people at risk of malnutrition and disease, and coping with a three-year drought, as well as a ruthlessly repressive regime, the last thing Afghanistan needed was another debilitating war. But war they had, and most of the casualties have been Afghan. Now that it is almost over, the nature of the peace is crucial. However, as the Taliban collapse or change sides, the competing ethnic alliances and tribal warlords jostle to seize strategic locations and make political claims. As the spearhead of the American military campaign, the predominately Tajik (25% of Afghanistan's population) and Uzbek (6%) Northern Alliance has laid claim to the capital, Kabul. But its misrule there in pre-Taliban days, between 1992 and 1996, earned it few friends. Pakistan in particular fears its success, and the fate of the Pashtuns (38%), while others support the Hazara (19%) and other minority peoples. The United States, more aware now than in the past of the need for a successful peace, has assisted the United Nations to sponsor a meeting of the leading rival factions in Bonn at the end of November, to create if possible a broad-based central administration and avoid internecine conflict.

Whatever the Government which emerges, it will need massive and sustained international assistance. The Afghan people are in dire straits. Aid agencies estimate that 7.5 million of

Afghanistan's 25 million people are at risk from war, drought and the coming winter. According to the UNHCR more than 4 million Afghans remain outside the country, mostly in Pakistan and Iran. Within the country more than a million fled their homes during the fighting, and in the north 3.4 million people depend entirely on foreign aid for food. The United Nations has launched an appeal for \$1.27 billion, of which just over 40% has so far been raised. Unfortunately, the argument that fighting terrorism internationally requires a global response to poverty, inequity and powerlessness – what John Wolfenson, President of the World Bank, has called the need to bring ‘the marginalised into the mainstream’ – has little appeal to the Howard Government. Australia has contributed just \$10 million to the UNHCR appeal. Nonetheless, the point is irrefutable. Conny Lenneberg, of Australian Volunteers International, an aid organisation involved in Afghanistan for nearly 15 years, makes it plain: ‘In a truly globalised community we need to address issues of justice and equality for everyone.’

### **The Right to Know**

From the creation of the ‘*Tampa* crisis’ in late August, through the hawking around the Pacific of the boat people who must never set foot on Australian soil, to the allegations of babies being thrown into the ocean, the whole issue of the treatment of asylum seekers, refugees and detainees has been handled by the Howard Government in a narrow minded, mean spirited and politically opportunistic fashion. The scope of the problem has been deliberately exaggerated. In the last twelve years, during which 12,500 asylum seekers were processed, of whom 3,500 were accepted, Australia accepted just over one million migrants. Yet refugees have been de-humanised, misrepresented and falsely labelled. They have been called ‘queue-jumpers’ when there is no queue; they are not competing with migrants, and Australia has not even filled its agreed quota of people whose refugee status has been scrutinised and accepted by the UNHCR. They have been called ‘wealthy’ (because they pay people-smugglers), ‘illegal’ (because they are not wanted), and entirely without proof, ‘the sort of people who would throw their children into the sea.’ Political phrasemongering, about ‘border protection and ‘sending a tough message’, and ‘we will control who comes to our country’ because ‘we know best what is in the national interest’, has replaced rational and informed debate. The use of the Royal Australian Navy to turn away boats and to ferry people around has been accompanied by unprecedented censorship of Navy personnel and limitation on freedom of the press. The Government has been able to malign ‘boat people’ largely with impunity, by confining them in distant places and preventing access to them, and hoping that ‘out of sight is out of mind.’ But political allegations without accountability undermine the very democracy which is supposed to be being defended.

The so-called ‘Pacific solution’ to Australia’s refugee problem has been a financial and diplomatic disaster. Having evinced no interest in assisting Pacific countries with their economic and environmental problems, Australia is now, according to a senior Fijian Government official, ‘simply bribing small island countries desperate for cash.’ The creation of a refugee compound on

the moonscape of Nauru was internationally demeaning for Australia, apart from denying natural justice and human rights to the detainees. But domestic criticism is lampooned, while standards of media accessibility and accountability are reduced. As the Jonathan Shier experiment at the ABC was finally halted by those who chose him in the first place, amidst embarrassment all round, the procedures and accountability of the ABC Board of Directors itself requires close scrutiny. The Board's independence has been clearly weakened by the sort of appointments made by the Howard Government. But no political or public forum exists before which the Board itself is obliged to defend either its past or future policies. Information about the management of refugee detention centres within Australia by Australasian Correctional Management is severely restricted by claims of commercial confidentiality, and it is hardly surprising that yet another inquiry has been necessary. Human Rights Commissioner Sev Ozdowski is to conduct a public inquiry into allegations of violence and denial of rights involving the nearly 600 children, some of them unaccompanied by adults, in detention centres. All in all, there has been a noticeable reduction in the extent of access to the information and the accountability of office-holders on which critical public debate and sound political decisions depend.

### **Graduate Peace and Conflict Studies, 2001**

This has been a successful year for our graduate programme in Peace and Conflict Studies. It has not only seen the introduction of two key units: Passion, Peace and Poetry; and Understanding and Attaining Human Rights, it has also attracted a large number of students from all over the world, including Australia, who bring inspiration, talent and dedication to the study of peace and justice. This year, our small Peace and Conflict Studies department achieved some of the highest enrolments

in graduate studies in the Faculty of Arts. Buoyed by the success of our programme, and on the urging of our students, we have introduced three new units to our 2002 programme: Reconciliation and Conflict Transformation: Concepts and Processes (Semester 1) which will be co-taught with the Koori Department; The United Nations and International Conflict Resolution (Semester 2); and Peace and the Environment: Issues of Conflict and Security (Semester 2).

Our Peace and Conflict Studies Programme is no longer part of Social Work and new units have been given the PACS prefixes to denote Peace and Conflict Studies. This year, through the dedicated work of Mark Molloy, Business Manager, Faculty of Arts, our department received its share of student fees to cover the teaching budget. We wish to thank Professor Ros Pesman, Pro-Vice Chancellor, College of Humanities and Social Sciences, for her invaluable assistance, and

Anne Emms, School Finance Manager; and Associate Professor Tim Fitzpatrick, Head of the School of Society, Culture and Performance, for their ongoing support.

Dr Jane Fulton

Teaching-Coordinator

Graduate Peace and Conflict Studies