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Host & Sponsors

Host: The Centre for Citizenship and Globalisation, Deakin University
The Centre for Citizenship and Globalisation is the foremost multidisciplinary research group studying citizenship and globalisation in Australia.
Visit deakin.edu.au/ccg for more information.

Sponsor: The Middle East Institute, National University of Singapore
The Middle East Institute seeks to promote awareness and understanding of the multidimensional relations between the Middle East and Asia.
Visit mei.nus.edu.sg for more information.

Sponsor: The Australian Middle East Research Forum, Deakin University
The Australian Middle East Research Forum is a collaborative research network focused on research into Middle East from an Australian perspective.
Visit deakin.edu.au/ccg/amerf for more information.
Welcome

It is with great pleasure that I welcome you to this symposium on the topic “Iraq 10 Years On: Intervention, Occupation, Withdrawal and Beyond”.

The tenth anniversary of the war in Iraq offers a timely opportunity to review the successes and failures of the intervention and the difficulties Iraq faces beyond the withdrawal. This symposium confronts a significant lacuna in academic and policy debates by engaging diplomatic staff, politicians, academics, business leaders, policy-makers, Iraqi expatriates, media and NGO’s concerned with Iraq in a robust exchange of ideas on the following key questions:

1. What were the key factors that led to the intervention and occupation of Iraq? What were the goals and how can we measure their successes and/or failures?
2. What is the legacy of the intervention in Iraq? And to what extent have bi- and multi-lateral relations between US/UK/AUS and Iraq been shaped by the intervention, occupation and withdrawal?
3. What are the lessons that have been learned in the last decade for the US/UK/AUS in terms of engagement with Iraq and the broader Middle East? And what are the examples of the most obvious failures and successes in Iraq since 2003?
4. What are the major opportunities and/or roadblocks on the path to investment, development, peace, security and mutually beneficial relations between US/UK/AUS and Iraq? And what are the opportunities to enhance the US/UK/AUS role in Iraq in the short- and long-term?

The answers to these and many other questions are sure to stimulate a very interesting and challenging two days. However, this symposium would not have been possible without the generous support of our host, the Centre for Citizenship and Globalization at Deakin University. I am especially grateful to our sponsors, the Middle East Institute at the National University of Singapore and the Australian Middle East Research Forum at Deakin University. This symposium would not have been possible without their commitment and I would like to take this opportunity to thank them for their collective efforts.

I look forward to meeting and talking with you over the next two days and please let me know if you need anything at all.

Kind regards,

Dr Benjamin Isakhan
**Program**

**Thursday 14 March**

8-8:30am:  *Registration*

8:30-10:  *Official Introduction and Welcome* – Prof Fethi Mansouri, Chair

Prof Joe Graffam, Pro-Vice Chancellor (Research Develop. & Training) – Official Welcome

Dr Benjamin Isakhan – Introduction to the Symposium

Her Excellency Ms Lyndall Sachs – Present and Future Australia-Iraq Relations

Prof Joseph A. Camilleri – The Global Implications of the Iraq War

10-10:30:  *Morning tea*

10:30-12:  *Australia’s Role in the Iraq War* – Prof Amin Saikal, Chair

Ms Aloysia Brooks – See No Evil: Australia’s Connection to Abu Ghraib

Dr Richard Hil – Othering Iraq: The Enduring Tragedy of Fallujah

Ms Donna Mulhearn – The Legacy and Lessons of Fallujah (and the Australian Connection)

12-1:  *Lunch*

1-2:  *An Iraq War Inquiry?* – Dr Rodger Shanahan, Chair

Mr Paul Barratt – The Case for an Iraq War Inquiry in Australia

Dr Jenny Grounds – How Highly did the Children Rate in the Decision to go to War in Iraq?

2-3:  *Australia and Iraq Today* – Mr Paul Barratt, Chair

Mr Ahmed Hassin – Australia’s Initiatives in Post-Conflict Nation Building in Iraq

Ms Libby Effeney – Protracted Displacement: Iraqi Refugees in Australia Since 2003

3-3:30:  *Afternoon tea*

3:30-4:30:  *The Media and Iraq* – Dr Richard Hil, Chair

Assoc Prof Martin Hirst – Does the Terror Frame still Dominate Media Coverage of Iraq in 2012?

Dr Perri Campbell – Women’s Stories From the Iraq War Blogosphere 10 Years On

4:30-5:30:  *Lessons Learned from the Iraq War* – Dr Benjamin MacQueen, Chair

Ms Diane Siebrandt – Heritage Destruction in Iraq: What are the Lessons Learned?

Dr Binoy Kampmark – Doctrines of Liberation and Humanitarian Intervention 10 Years On
Friday 15 March

8-8:30am:  Registration

8:30-10:   Keynote Address – Dr Benjamin Isakhan, Chair
Prof Liam Anderson – Ten Years on: Resolving Iraq’s Kurdish “Problem”

10-10:30:   Morning tea

10:30-11:30:   Minorities in Iraq Since 2003 – Prof Michael C. Hudson, Chair
Dr Benjamin MacQueen – De Facto Statehood and the Institutions of Governance in “Kurdistan-Iraq”
Mr Nicholas Al-jeloo – Post-Withdrawal Prospects for Indigenous Minority Groups in Iraq

11:30-12:30:   Lunch

12:30-2:   Regime Change and Democratization in Iraq – Prof Liam Anderson, Chair
Prof Michael C. Hudson – Second Thoughts on Regime Change by Force in Iraq
Prof Peter Sluglett – The Fire in Iraq: Arson or Accident?
Dr Rodger Shanahan – Between the Mosque and the State: The Role of Najaf in Iraqi Politics

2-2:30:   Afternoon tea

2:30-3:30:   Challenges to Democracy in Iraq – Prof Peter Sluglett, Chair
Prof Amin Saikal – Iraq: Between Democracy and Radical Islam
Dr Benjamin Isakhan – Oil and Democracy in Post-Saddam Iraq: The Case of the Iraq Federation of Oil Unions

3:30-5:25:   Roundtable Discussion: The Future of Iraq – Dr Benjamin Isakhan, Chair
Prof Liam Anderson, Prof Michael C. Hudson, Prof Peter Sluglett, Prof Amin Saikal, Prof Fethi Mansour, Prof Riadh Al-Mahaidi

5:25-5:30:   Closing Remarks and Thanks – Dr Benjamin Isakhan
Abstracts and Biographies

Thursday 14 March

Official Introduction and Welcome

Official Welcome
Prof Joe Graffam

Professor Joe Graffam is Pro-Vice Chancellor (Research Development & Training) at Deakin University, Australia. Prior to this, Joe was Pro Vice-Chancellor (Academic). Joe is also Professor and Chair in Psychology. He has worked in higher education for more than 30 years. Joe held early career positions as a researcher in the Neuropsychiatric Institute, School of Medicine, UCLA. Since commencing with Deakin University, Joe has filled several senior academic positions within the Faculty of Health. More recently, he served as Chair of the Academic Board of the University. He has received two Vice-Chancellor’s Awards for Excellent Contribution: Research – Research Facilitation (2004); and People, Culture and Change (2009). He has served on numerous University committees and working groups and been a member of the Academic Board since 2005. Joe’s research has focused on development and application of an ecological model for the study of community integration of people with a disability. He has an international reputation and served for several years on the Ministerial Disability Industry Advisory Group. Since 2000, he has also studied reintegration of ex-prisoners and is developing an international reputation in this area as well.

Introduction to the Symposium
Dr Benjamin Isakhan

Dr Benjamin Isakhan is Australian Research Council Discovery (DECRA) Senior Research Fellow at the Centre for Citizenship and Globalization, and Convenor of the Australian Middle East Research Forum at Deakin University, Australia. Previously, Ben was Research Fellow at the Centre for Dialogue at La Trobe University and Research Fellow for the Griffith University Islamic Research Unit, affiliated with the National Centre of Excellence for Islamic Studies, Australia. Dr Isakhan is the author of Democracy in Iraq: History, Politics and Discourse (Ashgate, 2012). Ben is also the editor of The Secret History of Democracy (Palgrave Macmillan, 2012 [2011]), The Arab Revolutions in Context: Civil Society and Democracy in a Changing Middle East (Melbourne University Press, 2012) and The Edinburgh Companion to the History of Democracy (Edinburgh University Press & Columbia University Press, 2012). In addition, Ben has authored several publications including around 15 scholarly book chapters, 12 refereed journal articles and more than 20 refereed conference papers. Broadly, his research interests concern issues such as: Democracy in Iraq, the history of democracy and Middle Eastern politics and history. Ben’s current research includes the ARC-funded project ‘Measuring the Destruction of Heritage and Spikes of Violence in Iraq’ (DE120100315) which involves several field trips to Iraq.
Present and Future Australia-Iraq Relations

Her Excellency Ms Lyndall Sachs

Her Excellency Ms Lyndall Sachs is Australian Ambassador to the Republic of Iraq in Baghdad, Iraq. She has also served as Ambassador to Lebanon, is currently a Senior Officer with the Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade (DFAT) and, before joining DFAT, Ms Sachs worked for the office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), London. She has also held a variety of positions in several other commonwealth government agencies.

The Global Implications of the Iraq War

Ten years after Washington’s decision to invade Iraq in March 2003 it is appropriate to ask three conceptually distinct yet closely interrelated questions: (a) What is the balance sheet so far as US regional and global hegemony is concerned? (b) What has been the impact of the US intervention on the incidence and intensity of terrorism? (c) What are the likely long-term consequences of the intervention for the normative and institutional underpinnings of international security? Far-reaching as the effects of the intervention have been on Iraqi society and politics, it is likely that future assessments of the intervention and its aftermath will increasingly dwell on these larger regional and global trends.

Prof Joseph A. Camilleri

Prof Joseph Anthony Camilleri is Professor of International Relations. He has just completed seven years as founding Director of the Centre for Dialogue, La Trobe University. Author of some 20 books and more than 100 book chapters and journal articles, his recent publications include: Co-edited Culture, Religion and Conflict in Muslim Southeast Asia (Routledge 2013) and Religion and Ethics in a Globalizing World: Conflict, Dialogue and Transformation (Palgrave MacMillan, 2011); co-authored Worlds in Transition: Evolving Governance Across a Stressed Planet (Edward Elgar 2009); and authored, Regionalism in the New Asia Pacific Order (Edward Elgar 2003), Edited Religion and Culture in Asia Pacific: Violence or Healing? (Vista 2001) and States, Markets and Civil Society in Asia Pacific (Edward Elgar 2000). Professor Camilleri is a Fellow of the Australian Academy of Social Sciences, and chairs the Editorial Committee of the scholarly journal Global Change, Peace and Security. He is the recipient of numerous national and international grants and awards, including the Order of Australia Medal.

Australia’s Role in the Iraq War

See No Evil: Australia’s Connection to Abu Ghraib
Whilst many remember the photos depicting the torture of the men in Abu Ghraib, the Australian connection has been somewhat obfuscated and hidden from public view. Not only was legal advice provided by an Australian Defence Force lawyer on interrogation techniques, but evidence has emerged linking Australian personnel to the hiding of detainees from the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC), and subsequently contributing to the cover up of torture in Abu Ghraib (PIAC, 2011). The legacy of Australia’s involvement in the Abu Ghraib scandal has significant consequences in relation to Australia’s standing in the international community as a country that purportedly entered into Iraq to restore ‘freedom and democracy’. This paper will discuss some of the long standing political and social impacts of the torture of prisoners in Iraq by coalition forces, and reflects on the consequences of Australia’s involvement in the cover-up of torture. More specifically, it explores the need for Australia to reflect on its mistakes made during the Iraq war, and move towards a path of transparency and accountability, rather than cover-up, if it is to contribute to longstanding peace in the region.

Ms Aloysia Brooks

Aloysia Brooks is a human rights and social justice advocate who campaigns for the promotion and protection of human rights in an increased security environment. Aloysia’s background is working with survivors of torture and trauma, and in advocacy organisations, including Amnesty International. Aloysia currently campaigns for accountability for torture in the war on terror, and is a lecturer at the Australian Catholic University. Aloysia completed her Masters of Human Rights at the University of Sydney in 2009 and is presently undertaking doctoral studies examining public representations of torture and torture prevention strategies.

Othering Iraq: The Enduring Tragedy of Fallujah

This presentation focuses the ways in which revisionist accounts of the 2003 Iraq war - especially those written by (some) veterans, embedded journalists and ‘historians’ - have, in effect, served to essentialise and de-legitimate “insurgents”, “terrorists”, “the muj” or more generally, “the enemy” and therefore to abstract them from any meaningful historical context or sense of agency. Drawing on the works of Edward Said, Emmanuel Levinas, Antonio Gramsci, Michael Foucault and Chris Hedges I argue that such accounts mask political motives and enforce triumphalist narratives which serve the interests of certain imperial powers. In drawing on the case of the “battle” of Fallujah in November 2004 I seek to highlight discursive practices that render the “enemy” as the other thereby obscuring them from both motive and context – practices familiar to the assertion of imperial power. I also illustrate the enduring tragedy experienced by Fallujahians and, in particular, how the use of certain forms of weaponry has led to catastrophic health consequences (for which the US government denies responsibility). I begin and conclude my presentation by addressing the implications of the above for peace advocates and anti-war activists.

Dr Richard Hil
Dr Richard Hil is Honorary Associate at the University of Sydney, Centre for Peace and Conflict Studies and Adjunct Associate Professor, School of Social Work and Human Services, Griffith University. Richard has taught at the University of York in the UK, and in Australia at James Cook University, University of the Sunshine Coast, Queensland University of Technology and Southern Cross University. His research and teaching interests are in the areas of social and community development, criminology, youth studies, and peace and conflict studies. Richard is author of several books including recent publications Erasing Iraq, Surviving Care, and Whackademia: An insider’s account of the troubled university. He has also been a regular columnist for The Australian, Campus Review and Australian Universities Review.

The Legacy and Lessons of Fallujah (and the Australian Connection)

As Australia takes up its seat at the UN Security Council stating an agenda of peace and disarmament, questions remain about its involvement in the invasion and occupation of Iraq including allegations of war crimes and human rights violations that involved Australian staff. In 2004 Australian Major-General Jim Molan, in his position of Chief of Operations was part of planning and directing Operation Phantom Fury the second assault on the city of Fallujah in 2004. The attacks on Fallujah delivered the most unrestricted assault on a densely populated city of the Iraq war and one of the fiercest and intense episodes of urban fighting in recent times. Human rights groups have documented the breach of more 70 articles of the Geneva conventions during the attacks, making them one of the most extreme examples of human rights violations. It is estimated up to 2000 civilians were killed, 36,000 houses demolished, 9,000 shops, 65 mosques, 60 schools, the heritage library and most government offices. Current reports of significant increases in cancers and birth deformities in Fallujah suggest the use of chemical weapons and possibly weapons containing depleted uranium have caused a lethal form of ‘slow violence’ on the health of the community.

As well as exploring Australia’s involvement, this paper will argue the attack on Fallujah can be compared with the ancient ‘sacking of a city’ and explore if it can be considered a case of ‘urbicide’ the killing of a city. What is the long-term legacy of the attacks on Fallujah? How will the documented human rights abuses be addressed? What is the recourse for the people of Fallujah? Who will be held accountable?

Ms Donna Mulhearn

Activist, writer and speaker, Donna Mulhearn, was a human shield during the war in Iraq and later returned as an aid worker and human rights activist. She is a journalist, former political adviser and completed her Masters at the University of Sydney Centre for Peace and Conflict Studies. She has just returned from her fifth trip to Iraq where she researched the effects of toxic weapons on the civilian population, particularly babies in the city of Fallujah. Featured on ABC’s Australian Story program, her book, Ordinary Courage, a memoir about her experience as a human shield, was published in 2010. She coordinates the Australian Campaign to Ban Uranium Weapons and is currently working on a book about the 2004 attacks on Fallujah.
An Iraq War Inquiry?

The Case for an Iraq War Inquiry in Australia

We now know a great deal about how Australia became involved in the war in Iraq, but the knowledge we have raises more questions than answers about how the Government of the day took that gravest of decisions, a decision to participate in the invasion of another sovereign state. The two inquiries which have been held to date looked only at the performance of the Australian intelligence agencies; neither of them had a brief to look at the more important question of how the Government itself performed. We still need a properly constituted enquiry with the powers to find authoritative answers to questions like:

- Did the government really think through the issues independently and consider the implications for our standing with Asian neighbours?
- Did it evaluate the intelligence presented to it and ignore its flaws? Did it want to?
- Did it consider the legal issues surrounding the proposed invasion objectively, or was it not really interested?
- Did the Cabinet formally sit down and consider all the issues calmly and clearly and make a determination based on that, or did it allow the Prime Minister effectively to pre-empt the deliberative process and commit Australian armed forces to the proposed US actions regardless of these considerations?
- Is this how decisions about the commitment of our armed forces to foreign campaigns should be made now and in the future?

The implications are profound. Clearly the current situation in which the decision to commit the ADF to international armed conflict is in the hands of a very small circle of people is insufficiently robust, and there is a need to ensure that Parliament is formally involved in any such decision in the future.

Mr Paul Barratt

Paul Barratt is President of the newly established Campaign for an Iraq War Inquiry, which seeks not only the establishment of an inquiry into the decision-making process which led to Australian participation in the invasion of Iraq, but the involvement of the Parliament in all future decisions to deploy the Australian Defence Force into armed international conflict. He is a former Secretary of the Departments of Defence and of Primary Industries and Energy, and a former Deputy Secretary of the Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade.

How Highly did the Children Rate in the Decision to go to War in Iraq?

The war in Iraq was totally avoidable, and the effects on the health and wellbeing were utterly predictable, indeed predicted. Many informed parties forecast a long and destabilizing war. Several studies on the likely humanitarian effects had been produced,
two by Medact in the UK, and one by the Centre for Economic and Social Rights, New York, as well as groups such as Red Cross/Red Crescent and UNICEF.

All demonstrated that any attack on Iraq would threaten the lives, health and environment of many Iraqis, especially children, who were already suffering malnutrition and disease due to the first Iraq war and the subsequent economic sanctions. As an indicator of this, the Infant mortality rate in Iraq was 65 per 1000 live births in 1991 but had nearly doubled by 1998. All reports indicated that the international community had little capacity to respond to the harm that children would suffer by a new war. A statement issued by a group of Australian federal politicians in 2003 opposed our involvement in the war, and stated that “Civilians are the first casualties of war. War will mean further humanitarian devastation, and a flood of new refugees”.

An inquiry into Australia’s involvement in Iraq should take place, in part to examine how much the information available about humanitarian consequences was taken into account. Such an inquiry is likely to recommend that a wide and informed debate and support of both houses of parliament by required for a commitment to war.

Dr Jenny Grounds

Dr Jenny Grounds is the current president of the Medical Association for Prevention of War, the Australian Affiliate of IPPNW, International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War. MAPW is a professional not-for-profit organisation that works to promote peace and disarmament. MAPW aims to reduce the physical and psychological impact, as well as environmental effect of wars throughout the world. Jenny has been a General Practitioner in rural Victoria for 20 years. She trained and worked at the Repatriation Hospital in Heidelberg and later in community health in North Richmond, Victoria, working with refugees from various regions affected by war. She is a member of CIWI, Campaign for an Iraq War Inquiry, led by Paul Barratt.

Australia and Iraq Today

Australia’s Initiatives in Post-Conflict Nation Building in Iraq

After decades of growth and development, Iraq has become amongst the worst performing states worldwide as a legacy of successive wars and sanctions despite the rich endowment with ample natural resources and capable human resources. Many observers expected that the “new” Iraq after the US “liberation” in 2003 will be a tolerant and unified nation-state that “with a degree of civil society” will grant and secure the human rights for all the Iraqi people (Gresham 2006: 27). However, due to the external military intervention lead by the US, the Iraq state collapsed after the 2003 war (Diamond 2005) as well as its economic, educational, health systems and infrastructure; and, Iraq’s development indicators are amongst the lowest globally (Hassin 2010). Australia’s controversial joining of Bush’s Coalition of Willing has been discussed by various intellectual studies from different angles. It is discussed in the socio-political discourse from an international relations perspective (Verrier 2003), social resistance to war (Hil 2008), and the implications on the Australian
internal politics (McAllister and Bean 2006) and federal elections (Kelton 2008). However, there is scarce evidence about any research engaging with Australia’s roles in post-conflict nation building in Iraq. This article explores developmental roles and initiatives played and funded by Australia in Iraq since the invasion in 2003. Based on Hippler’s (Hippler 2004-2005) multi-faceted approach to nation building this paper will study Australia’s roles in the three interlinked dimensions or “starting points” for nation building: improvement of living conditions, structural reforms and integration of the national political system.

Mr Ahmed Hassin

Ahmed is a PhD candidate at Deakin University. His thesis explores the roles of civil society organisations in post-conflict nation building and reconstruction in Iraq since the US-led invasion of 2003. In 2004, Ahmed established an NGO in Iraq that deals with disability issues and has been successful in service provision and capacity building for more than 10,000 beneficiaries. Ahmed holds a B.A. in English from Baghdad University, an M.B.A. in Management Practice, Change management and Organisation development from Victoria University and an M.A International and Community Development from Deakin University. Ahmed’s research interests include Iraq, civil society, management and development of NGOs and developmental studies.

Protracted Displacement: Iraqi Refugees in Australia Since 2003

The displaced from Iraq constitute one of the largest refugee populations worldwide, with official estimates at 4.5 million people. Australia is very much embroiled in this protracted displacement crisis, given its role as a key member of the “Coalition of the Willing” that launched the pre-emptive strike on Iraq in 2003, as well as being a founding signatory to the UN Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees. Despite this, successive Australian Governments have played a minimal role in operationalizing solutions to the mass-displacement of Iraqis and instead peddle a contradictory politics of forced migration; a politics that simultaneously touts and eschews its commitment to universal human rights under international law. This politics affects the settlement outcomes for Iraqis who have managed to migrate to Australia since 2003, many arriving as “Irregular Maritime Arrivals” seeking Asylum. The journey of displacement for most of this group has been protracted and fraught, and continues to be so in Australia. Research conducted over the past decade shows that the newly arrived Iraqi refugee community in Australia have relatively poor settlement outcomes, in particular exhibiting poor mental and physical health and high unemployment. The quandary in which many Iraqi refugees in Australia find themselves raises important ethical questions about the country’s interpretation of universal human rights and Australia’s obligations to displaced Iraqis, as well as the inadequacy of global governance mechanisms.

Ms Libby Effeney

Ms Libby Effeney joined the Centre for Citizenship and Globalization in December 2010 as a Doctoral candidate and research assistant. Her PhD project is entitled, ‘Exploring the Potential for a Cosmopolitan Ethic in Australia: the Case of Iraqi Asylum seekers’. She is also involved in the Centre’s ARC Linkage Project, ‘social Networks, Belonging and Active Citizenship among Migrant youth in Australia.’ In 2009, Libby graduated with a Masters of
Middle East studies from Middle East Technical University in Ankara, Turkey. Her thesis in political anthropology was entitled ‘Political identities of kurdish youth in Ankara, Turkey’.

**The Media and Iraq**

Does the Terror Frame still Dominate Media Coverage of Iraq in 2012?

Since George Bush senior’s first Iraq incursion in 1991, many news events from the Middle East have been framed using the ideological construction of a looming and ever-present existential threat to the lifestyles and ideals of ‘the West’. This ‘threat’ is characterised as an almost disembodied entity ‘terrorism’; a seemingly irrational and unpredictable, if not ‘insane’ ideology that is beyond explanation and control (Gerbner, 1992; Hirst & Patching, 2005, 2007; Hirst & Schutze, 2004a, 2004b). The terror frame is not limited to post-1991 conflicts. British PM Margaret Thatcher famously invoked the ‘oxygen of publicity’ argument to deny the IRA airtime on British television in the late 1970s and early 1980s. However, over the past two decades, framing global conflicts in terms of ‘good’ versus ‘evil’ and describing enemies as ‘terrorist’, or as supportive of ‘terrorism’, has remained an essential ideological tool for Western governments keen to build and shore up support for shaky and dubious military alliances and interventions across the globe.

This paper examines the history of the twenty-first century terror frame and how it continues to shape coverage of the situation in Iraq today. One finding of the study that is non-controversial and not surprising is that in 2012 coverage of Iraq in the mainstream Western media was only around 20 per cent of what it was in 2003. This has implications for how audiences in nations allied to the ‘Coalition of the Willing’ – who share some responsibility for the ‘rebuilding’ of Iraq – might relate to the rebuilding process. Perhaps unfortunately, the lessons of Iraq are more likely to be cited in relation to the ongoing ‘war on terror’ (Burke, 2013) than in how to conduct reconstruction of Iraq’s war-damaged infrastructure, nationhood and national psyche.

The diminished range of coverage means that Iraq is rarely on the front page or at the head of the broadcast bulletin today. In this context one might expect public interest in, and knowledge of, events in Iraq to be lower. It might also create problems for analysts and public policy-makers who find that their arguments, suggestions and solutions do not gain traction in influencing public opinion.

Assoc Prof Martin Hirst

Martin Hirst is Associate Professor in Journalism & Multimedia at Deakin University. He is a former senior reporter and Press Gallery correspondent who has been in academia since 1993. He has written, edited and co-authored six books and numerous journal articles. He has been working on media and terrorism issues for 15 years. Dr Hirst is a political economist with a particular interest in journalism law and ethics and the politics of news.

Women’s Stories From the Iraq War Blogosphere 10 Years On
In March 2003 Iraq was invaded and occupied by US led forces. In the early years of the war a number of Iraqi women joined the Iraq war blogosphere commenting on social and political chaos in Iraq and documenting the challenges they faced in their everyday lives.

The women’s stories also open up channels for communication, providing people around the world with a unique way of knowing about and remembering the last decade of Iraq’s history. But, as one young Iraqi blogger ‘Hadiya’ asks, will we really ‘dare to hear?’

In this paper I respond to the questions and stories of Iraqi bloggers Hadiya and her sister Aunt Najma. The sisters each write a digital-self which is captured in the archives of their blogs as particular moments in time, catastrophic events and family dynamics. The blogosphere offers bloggers like Hadiya and Najma possibilities for reflexive thinking, for engaging with and critiquing social limits, and for shaping a digital self and practicing freedom. This is a space for saying and doing things that are not always safe offline. Digital spaces enable women to write a self during a time of war and at the same time provide readers like us – in remote countries – a window into life in Iraq.

Dr Perri Campbell

Perri Campbell is located in the School of Education at Deakin University in Geelong. Dr Campbell’s research interest lies at the crossroads of gender studies, critical social theory, media and youth studies, with a particular focus on digital communication. Perri’s research concerns the use of digital communication technologies in post-conflict zones. Her research explores the ways in which digital technologies provide a window into life worlds, connect digital Others, and provide a platform for storytelling and different historical accounts to emerge.

Lessons Learned from the Iraq War

Heritage Destruction in Iraq: What are the Lessons Learned?

Everyone is familiar with the looting of the Iraq Museum in Baghdad in April of 2003, while this was a devastating incident, there are many cultural sites located throughout the country that also suffered from a variety of other problems between 2003 and 2012. These range from targeted bombings of sites, unlawful construction of modern structures on ancient ruins, and severe conservation neglect of sites due to fear of conservators visiting volatile provinces. Each of these has led to varying degrees of damages to many of Iraq’s cultural heritage sites.

This paper will discuss the different types of destruction inflicted on cultural heritage sites in Iraq, including ancient archaeological ruins, modern and historical cultural material, and religious sites. I will provide examples outlining lessons learned over the course of the past decade, what was done properly, and what could have been done better. Why were the ruins of Babylon used as a military base, and what was the impact on the site? Was tearing down the numerous Saddam Hussein murals and statues ultimately beneficial to the Iraqi population? The bombing of the Al-Askari Mosque in Samarra incited Sectarian violence,
could this have been prevented? From these and other examples, we should be able to piece together a plan to prevent or at least mitigate a repeat of past mistakes.

Ms Diane Siebrandt

Diane Siebrandt worked in Iraq overseeing the American Embassy’s Cultural Heritage Program between 2006 and 2012. She was able to visit much of the country during her time there, gaining first-hand knowledge while working on numerous sites, including archaeological ruins, modern cultural monuments and religious structures. Prior to that, she was part of the Regime Crimes Liaison Office that excavated and analyzed material from mass graves found in Iraq. Diane is currently a PhD student at Deakin University, focusing on tracking the destruction of cultural heritage in Iraq and how it relates to peaks and ebbs of violence.

Doctrines of Liberation and Humanitarian Intervention 10 Years On

The paper looks at the state of humanitarian intervention 10 years after the invasion of Iraq, bearing in mind the various motivations that led to the invasion in 2003. It covers, broadly speaking, the first three themes of the conference: motivation, legacy and lessons. It examines the role oppressed civilians play in the rhetoric of invasion and salvation. Who is actually being saved in such an invasion? It argues that humanitarianism, to begin with, is a problematic concept susceptible to semantic manipulation. False security premises are submitted alongside images of brutality and terror. Terms such as liberation tend to provide the thin coating for broader exercises of power. This was the case in 2003 and still forms the basis of Western interventions in the Middle East and Africa. Examples of this are discussed in the context of the invasion of Iraq and how this has influenced the conduct of subsequent interventions (Libya, Mali). Are there humanitarian solutions to humanitarian problems?

Dr Binoy Kampmark

Dr. Binoy Kampmark was a Commonwealth Scholar at Selwyn College, Cambridge. He is currently a lecturer in the School of Global, Social and Urban Studies, RMIT University. He has published extensively on international security (Review of International Affairs, Historical Journal, Journal of Genocide Research) and writes regularly for The Conversation, Eureka Street and CounterPunch.
Friday 15 March

Keynote Address

Ten Years on: Resolving Iraq’s Kurdish “Problem”

Ten years on from Operation Iraqi Freedom, Iraq’s political leaders find themselves at a crossroads. The worst of the violence that brought the country to the brink of civil war appears to be over, and now leaders must grapple with a series of deeply contentious issues that cut to the core of the design of the Iraqi state. Many of the most divisive issues -- such as the division of powers between Baghdad and the regions, management of the oil and gas sector, and the future status of disputed territories in northern Iraq -- are intertwined, and relate in one way or another to the current and future status of the Kurds in Iraq.

The approval of the constitution in 2005 by a large majority of Iraqi people appeared to signify an important triumph for the Kurds. Along with their Shi’ite allies from the Islamic Supreme Council of Iraq (ISCI), the Kurds were heavily involved in the drafting process, producing a document that satisfied almost all their "red-line" demands. As subsequent events have indicated, however, the Kurds’ triumph may have been more apparent than real. The major problem for the Kurds is that many of the constitutional provisions deemed to be in the Kurds’ vital interest are precisely those most strongly opposed by Arab (whether Sunni or Shi’a) nationalists. These include Article 140, which outlines a procedure for the resolution of disputed territories, but also many of those provisions that relate to the powers of regions relative to the federal government, especially with regard to the management of oil and gas. Among the overwhelming majority of the Sunni Arab community, as well a significant segment of the Shi’a Arab community, the preference is for a unitary system of government with a strong central government, and national control over the exploitation of oil and gas reserves. The constitution, meanwhile, depicts a system of federalism based on powerful regions, a weak federal government, and regional domination over the management of oil and gas.

In the absence of a basic consensus on the founding document of the new Iraqi state, the system remains mired in gridlock and devoid of key institutions, such as a Supreme Court; with no Supreme Court, there is no entity with the authority to adjudicate among branches of government and between levels of government. In this judicial vacuum, executive power is increasingly exercised without regard for constitutional parameters and Iraq continues its slide towards authoritarian rule. Iraq, therefore, urgently needs a new constitutional settlement that respects Kurdish autonomy while facilitating Arab (Sunni/Shi’a) reconciliation. This paper outlines the contours of such a settlement.

Prof Liam Anderson

Liam Anderson obtained his MPhil in International Relations from Cambridge University, UK, and his PhD in Political Science from the University of Georgia. He is currently a Professor of Political Science at Wright State University, where he teaches classes in Comparative Politics and International Relations. His research interests focus on issues of constitutional design, particularly with reference to ethnically divided states, such as Iraq.
His publications include, The Future of Iraq: Dictatorship, Democracy, or Division (2005) and Crisis in Kirkuk: The Ethnopolitics of Conflict and Compromise (2009) (both with Gareth Stansfield), An Atlas of Middle Eastern Affairs (with EW Anderson) (2011), and “Avoiding Ethnic Conflict in Iraq: Some Lessons from the Aland Islands” (published in the journal Ethnopolitics). His most recent book – Federal Solutions to Ethnic Problems: Accommodating Diversity – examines the efficacy of different models of federal design to alleviate ethnic conflict and was published by Routledge in 2013. He is currently working on a manuscript on the disputed territories of Northern Iraq.

Minorities in Iraq Since 2003

De Facto Statehood and the Institutions of Governance in “Kurdistan-Iraq”

Since October 1991, the provinces of Dohuk, Erbil, and Suleimaniyah in northern Iraq have been administered outside the authority of the central government in Baghdad. From the formation of the Kurdistan Front in 1991 to the Kurdish Regional Government (KRG) in 2009, “Kurdistan-Iraq” has developed institutions of governance that are arguably more efficacious than the Iraqi government and, indeed, many governments across the region. However, like so much of post-occupation Iraq, the status of “Kurdistan-Iraq” remains ambiguous. This ambiguity stems in large part from the tentative stance of the KRG vis-à-vis independence as well as the numerous uncertainties around the Iraqi constitution, the federal structure of the country as a whole, and the status of Kirkuk.

This paper will explore the question of whether “Kurdistan-Iraq” is, in the parlance of International Relations theory, a de facto state, an autonomous region, or a federal region. It is argued that this will not only enable greater clarity on the utility of these concepts, but will also highlight the uncertain status of “Kurdistan-Iraq” affects the very development of its political institutions. In particular, efforts toward gaining international legitimacy by the KRG, whether or not this is aimed at independence or more modest capacity-building, has accelerated the institution-building process and forced political elites toward political participation and cooperation rather than violent confrontation. As such, the success of state-building in “Kurdistan-Iraq” is one rooted in both a context and time-specific environment.

Dr Benjamin MacQueen

Dr Benjamin MacQueen is a Senior Lecturer in the School of Political and Social Inquiry at Monash University. His research and teaching centres on conflict, its resolution, and issues surrounding post-conflict reconstruction in the Middle East and North Africa. His most recent publications include An Introduction to Middle East Politics (Sage: London, 2013) and American Democracy Promotion in the Changing Middle East (London: Routledge, 2012), with Shahram Akbarzadeh, James Piscator, & Amin Saikal. He is currently working on an ARC-funded project exploring elections and their role in enhancing political participation in Egypt, Iraq, and Lebanon.
Post-Withdrawal Prospects for Indigenous Minority Groups in Iraq

With the signing of Iraq’s Transitional Administrative Law on 8 March 2004 a new, pluralistic era for Iraq, began. Iraq was now a “country of many nationalities” (Article 7 B). Minority languages such as Turcoman, Syriac and Armenian were now allowed to be officially taught in government institutions (Article 9), and “the administrative, cultural and political rights of the Turcomans and ChaldoAssyrians and all other citizens” were now guaranteed by law (Article 53 D). In addition, all Iraqi citizens were now equal in their rights “without regard to gender, sect, opinion, belief, nationality, religion, or origin” (Article 12), and it was outlawed for any Iraqi to be discriminated against in electoral voting “on the basis of gender, religion, sect, race, belief, ethnic origin, language, wealth or literacy” (Article 20 B). On 8 November 2008, Iraqi leaders ratified a bill guaranteeing a quota of six seats in the parliament for “minority groups,” with Christians allotted three and Yazidis, Shabak and Mandaeans one each.

Iraq’s “ultra-minorities” have often been regarded as a barometer of pluralism in the “new Iraq.” In a speech delivered on 7 October 2002, President George W. Bush stated that, “The oppression of Kurds, Assyrians, Tukomans, Shi’a, Sunnis and others will be lifted.” During the 10 years since the coalition’s intervention and occupation of Iraq, however, ChaldoAssyrians, Turkmen, Shabak, Yazidis and Mandaeans have emerged as among the most vulnerable of the country’s citizens and their prospects beyond the withdrawal of coalition troops remain bleak. This paper will explore the successes and failures of this period in regards to these indigenous minorities, ten years on, referring especially to recent human rights reports.

Mr Nicholas Al-Jeloo

Nicholas Al-Jeloo is an Australian-born Iraqi-Assyrian and a PhD candidate in Syriac studies at the University of Sydney. He has conducted numerous field trips to Iraq and amongst Iraqi refugee communities in Syria, Jordan and Lebanon between 2002 and 2010. He is also an artist and amateur photographer, and his exhibition about Assyrian life in the Middle East “Persistence and Existence” has shown at mainstream art galleries and public libraries in both Sydney and Melbourne. Among his publications are the Modern Aramaic (Assyrian/Syriac) Phrasebook and Dictionary (2007), and Persistence and Existence (2010). He has also participated in numerous international conferences, presenting his research on the Assyrians in Iraq and other countries.

Regime Change and Democratization in Iraq

Second Thoughts on Regime Change by Force in Iraq

The paper reviews the history of American relations with Iraq beginning with the era of the Baghdad Pact to the rise of Saddam Hussein. It explores US efforts to strengthen Iraq as a counterweight to the Islamic revolutionary regime in Iran and the subsequent change of course following Saddam’s raid on Kuwait. The era of “dual containment” under Clinton is seen as an effort to weaken Iraq with severe sanctions while allowing it to retain sufficient
coherence as a balance against Iran. At the same time, however, it shows how the neoconservative movement, influenced by Israel and its concern over possible Iraqi WMDs, was beginning to agitate for regime change. In the first George W. Bush administration, and especially after the 9/11 attacks, the neoconservatives found themselves well-positioned to push their radical proposal both on grounds of security and idealism--the obligation to bring democracy to a society suffering under tyranny. The paper describes how the White House was convinced that regime change by force would lead to a stable democratic outcome, while many academic analysts warned of unexpected and negative consequences. The project to overthrow Saddam and establish a stable, pro-Western democracy is depicted as the most expensive political science experiment in history. The last part of the paper looks at the post-mortems: did Bush's "freedom agenda" for Iraq inspire the Arab spring? Was it a strategic blunder opening the door to the expansion of Iranian influence in the Gulf? Could regime change in this quintessential "mukhabarat state" have been accomplished without foreign military intervention? Was the operation a war of necessity or a war of choice, and did the benefits outweigh the costs--human and material? The paper concludes by asserting that America's misadventure in Iraq has significantly hastened the decline of American influence in the region and globally.

Prof Michael C. Hudson

Professor Michael C. Hudson was appointed Director of the Middle East Institute and Professor of Political Science at National University of Singapore in 2010. Before being appointed Professor Emeritus at Georgetown University he was Director of Georgetown’s Center for Contemporary Arab Studies and Professor of International Relations and Seif Ghobash Professor of Arab Studies. He did his undergraduate studies at Swarthmore College and holds the M.A. and Ph.D. in political science from Yale University. His research interests include political liberalization, politics in divided societies, Lebanese politics, U.S. Middle East policy, Gulf politics and security, the Arab-Israeli conflict, the information revolution in the Arab world, and Asia-Middle East relations. Among Prof. Hudson's publications are The Precarious Republic: Political Modernization in Lebanon (Random House 1968 and Westview 1985); The World Handbook of Political and Social Indicators (Yale University Press, 1972, second ed., co-author); Arab Politics: The Search for Legitimacy, (Yale University Press, 1977), The Palestinians: New Directions (editor and contributor), and Middle East Dilemma: The Politics and Economics of Arab Integration (New York: Columbia University Press, 1999: editor and contributor). He also has published analysis articles on current Middle East issues on the websites of AlJazeera, Jadaliyya, and the Foreign Policy Middle East channel, as well as the Middle East Institute’s website.

The Fire in Iraq: Arson or Accident?

This paper will attempt to review some of the principal misconceptions behind US policy towards Iraq in the years immediately preceding and immediately after the invasion, and how these affected the course of events on the ground. It will also attempt to analyse the immense changes that had taken part in Iraqi society in the last decade of Saddam Husayn’s rule, and note how imperfectly these changes had been understood or perceived outside the country.
One consequence of this was the way in which ‘religious politics’ of a variety of hues had gradually become the only widely acceptable form of political discourse, a fact which neither the Iraqi exiles nor the Americans whose ear they had in Washington had begun to apprehend by the late 1990s or early 2000s. The exiles thought that they were going back to more or less recognisable version of the country they had left as children or as young adults, and US policy makers did not question their judgement, especially since it dovetailed so neatly with their own.

Prof Peter Sluglett

Peter Sluglett is visiting Professor at the Middle East Institute, National University of Singapore; he has been Professor of Middle East History at the University of Utah since 1994. He has a BA from Cambridge (1966) and a DPhil from Oxford (1972). His main research interests are in late nineteenth and twentieth century Iraq, Lebanon and Syria, and in the urban social history of the Arab Middle East. He is currently writing a general history of Syria for Cambridge University Press. His main publications include (ed. with Stefan Weber), Syria and Bilad al-Sham under Ottoman Rule: Essays in Honour of Abdul-Karim Rafeq, Brill, 2010; (ed.), The Urban Social History of the Middle East 1750-1950, Syracuse University Press, 2008; Britain in Iraq: Contriving King and Country, London, I. B. Tauris and Columbia University Press, 2007, (and Marion Farouk-Sluglett) Iraq since 1958: from Revolution to Dictatorship. 3rd revised edn., I.B. Tauris, 2001 (translated into German, Arabic and Czech).

Between the Mosque and the State: The Role of Najaf in Iraqi Politics

Iraq is a majority Shi’a state, plays host to the holiest of Shi’a Islam’s sites, its most respected schools of learning and the burial place of the majority of its Imams. But as it has emerged from decades of secular Ba’thist rule it has found the transition to majority Shi’a a difficult one to make. Apart from a sectarian insurgency that refuses to die out, the degree to which Shi’a religious figures have a say in Iraqi politics and the nature of Iraqi society remains an issue that has yet to be resolved.

Part of the difficulty in determining an agreed role has been the independence that is central to the role played by the hawza (or centre of learning) and an unwillingness to return to the status quo ante where Najafi political activism was met with a brutal response by Saddam’s government.

This paper will discuss the nexus between the Najafi hawza and political decision-making in post-invasion Iraq. It will be argued that while Najaf’s scholarly independence has been maintained despite the wishes of many amongst Baghdad’s political elite, its ability to maintain this influence remains in question. Who will succeed Grand Ayatollah Sistani, accusations that Iran seeks to gain more influence in the heart of Arab Shi’ism and a desire on the part of central government to reduce the influence of the hawza are all issues that go to the heart of the role of Najaf in contemporary Iraq.

Dr Rodger Shanahan
Challenges to Democracy in Iraq

Iraq: Between Democracy and Radical Islam

Many scholars have long argued that only indigenous processes can lead to effective democratisation of a polity. The criteria by which they generally evaluate the pace, success and outcome of democratisation go beyond the ideals and experiences of traditional democracies, like Britain, France, the United States and Australia, taking into account the national peculiarities and circumstances of the country subjected to democratic reforms, and contending that the methods and outcomes can differ from country to country. On the other hand, some conservative analysts have argued that exogenous stimuli can assist in speeding up the processes of democratisation, which otherwise can be very slow, drawn out and possibly very turbulent. They have advocated interventionism, even to the point of military action, by the leading democracies, most importantly the United States, to pave the way for transformations of an authoritarian state to a democratic one. They are hooked more on Western criteria of what constitutes democratisation and democracy than on what can be achieved commensurate to the realities on the ground in the given country. Their choice of the state that should be subjected to interventionist democratisation is determined not only by ideology but also geopolitical preferences. Iraq is often cited as an example of such states, where US-led intervention, it is claimed, has resulted in a process of transition to a democracy. The purpose of this expose is to look at the case of Iraq in order to evaluate where it is in its process of democratic change and whether interventionist democratisation has worked.

Prof Amin Saikal

Amin Saikal is Professor of Political Science and Director of the Centre for Arab and Islamic Studies (the Middle East and Central Asia) at the Australian National University. Professor Saikal has been a visiting fellow at Princeton University, Cambridge University, and the Institute of Development Studies at the University of Sussex, as well as a Rockefeller Foundation Fellow in International Relations (1983-1988). He was awarded the Order of Australia (AM) in January 2006 for his services to the international community and education as well as an advisor and author. He is the author of numerous works on the Middle East, Central Asia, and Russia. His latest publications include 'American Democracy...
Oil and Democracy in Post-Saddam Iraq: The Case of the Iraq Federation of Oil Unions

Since the democratic elections held across Iraq in 2005 and again in 2010 much attention has understandably been paid to the machinations of the new Iraqi government. Unfortunately, it has become increasingly clear that Prime Minister Nuri Al-Maliki and his ruling State of Law Coalition (SLC) are practising the type of governance referred to in the literature on other Arab states alternatively as ‘liberalised autocracy’ (Brumberg, 2002), ‘semi-authoritarianism’ (Ottaway, 2003) or ‘pluralised authoritarianism’ (Posusney & Angrist, 2005). That is to say, that the Maliki government is consolidating its incumbency while putting in place measures that can be considered more or less liberal. To do this, the regime actually utilises (and controls) nominally democratic mechanisms such as elections, media freedoms, political opposition and civil society as part of their strategy to retain power. This is perhaps best demonstrated via the nine month political stalemate that followed the March 2010 elections and Maliki’s refusal to step down despite having narrowly lost the election. Not surprisingly, the Iraqi people have become increasingly disillusioned with their political leaders and deeply critical of their ability to provide a robust and genuine democracy – hence the mass protests that have swept across Iraq since 2010.

However, these latest Iraqi protests are only the most recent and overt sign of the hidden geographies that are agitating towards democracy in this deeply troubled and increasingly authoritarian state. Indeed, since the invasion of 2003 and the subsequent protracted occupation, a complex array of political, religious and ethno-sectarian factions have formed political parties and civil society movements; uncensored news has been enthusiastically produced and consumed across the nation; ordinary citizens have taken to the streets to protest key government decisions; and various local councils have been formed, deliberating and deciding on key decisions facing their immediate communities (Davis, 2004, 2007; Isakhan, 2008, 2011). Given this context, this chapter focuses on the specific case of the Iraqi Federation of Oil Unions (IFOU), Iraq’s largest and most powerful independent workers union. The IFOU has repeatedly taken the Iraqi government to task over their poor pay and the dangerous nature of their work, as well as the government’s initial kowtowing to US plans to privatise the entire Iraqi oil sector. To do this, the IFOU have utilised a rich array of very democratic mechanisms including peaceful strikes and protests, media campaigns and political lobbying. But when such measures have failed to garner the desired results, the IFOU has gone as far as halting oil production and cutting off the supply of oil, kerosene and gas to the rest of the country. Such moves have met with mixed results in Baghdad – at times the central government has pandered to the requests of IFOU, at other times it has gone as far as issuing arrest warrants for the senior members of the union. It is
for all of these reasons that the IFOU serve as an interesting example of informal power in Iraq and may well pose one of the greatest challenges to rising authoritarianism there.

Dr Benjamin Isakhan
(See earlier).

Roundtable Discussion: The Future of Iraq

Prof Liam Anderson, Prof Michael C. Hudson, Prof Peter Sluglett, Prof Amin Salkal
(See earlier).

Prof Fethi Mansouri

Professor Fethi Mansouri is UNESCO Chair in Comparative Research on Cultural Diversity and Social Justice and the Director of the Centre for Citizenship and Globalisation at Deakin University. Professor Mansouri has published fourteen books, nine major research monographs, more than sixty refereed research articles and book chapters, and many book reviews and media pieces. He has presented more than 120 invited conference and seminar papers and many other invited presentations at national and international symposia. Over the last ten years, Professor Mansouri has been awarded more than 30 research grants from a number of funding bodies. His many publications include Australia and the Middle East: A Front-Line Relationship (I.B. Tauris), The Arab Revolutions in Context: Civil Society and Democracy in a Changing Middle East (Melbourne University Press), Political Islam and Human Security (Cambridge Scholars Publishing) and Islam and Political Violence: Muslim Diaspora and Radicalism in the West (I.B. Tauris).

Prof Riadh Al-Mahaidi

Professor Riadh Al-Mahaidi is the President of the Australian Iraqi Forum and Professor of Structural Engineering at Swinburne University of Technology in Melbourne, Australia. He is also an Adjunct Professor of Civil Engineering at Monash University in Melbourne Australia. Professor Al-Mahaidi received his BSc degree in civil engineering from the University of Baghdad and MSc and PhD degrees in structural engineering from Cornell University in the United States. Prior to moving to Australia with his wife and three children in 1992, Professor Al-Mahaidi was an Assistant/Associate Professor of Civil Engineering at the University of Baghdad. Professor Al-Mahaidi makes frequent visits to Iraq at the invitation of many Iraqi universities, Ministry of Housing and Construction, Ministry of Oil and other organisations to deliver lectures and training courses in the area civil infrastructure assessment and rehabilitation. Dr Al-Mahaidi has written and was interviewed extensively on the political situation in Iraq and the status of Iraq's higher
education system. His advice was sought by AUSDAID, AUSTRADE and DEEWR in Canberra on Australia’s aid programs to Iraq.
Other Useful Information

Location and Directions
This symposium will be held at Deakin University Melbourne City Centre (DUMCC) which is located in Melbourne's central business district at:

Level 3, 550 Bourke St
Melbourne 3000

Parking at Deakin University Melbourne City Centre

Please note the most convenient offsite parking is Wilson Parking located at 570 Bourke Street (via Gresham Street). Hours of operation are 6:30am-8pm Monday to Friday. Parking fees do apply. Please refer to the below link for pricing and early bird offers - http://www.wilsonparking.com.au/go/wilson-car-parks/vic/570-bourke-street

Public Transport

Deakin University Melbourne City Centre is accessible via public transport plan your trip via the PTV website.
THE CENTRE FOR CITIZENSHIP AND GLOBALISATION
A Deakin University Strategic Research Centre

deakin.edu.au/ccg/events