Globalisation:
Understanding the global issues that affect us all

MALA Short Course
Every Friday, 17 August – 14 September 2012, 10am-11:15am

The Bluestocking Institute for Global Peace and Justice is thrilled to introduce the MALA short course, *Globalisation: Understanding the global issues that affect us all*.

The course aims to provide participants with insights into the kaleidoscope of 'globalisation'. It includes an overview of major issues and debates, with some real life accounts and examples. We encourage an open, inclusive, interactive learning environment with space and time for fruitful discussions.

This booklet is a guide to each session. It provides key readings that correspond with each week's topic, with questions to ponder as you read. We have also listed a number of questions to help stimulate discussion during the sessions. For more information, including relevant readings, internet sites, YouTube clips etc, head to the Bluestocking website at www.bluestockinginstitute.org.

We hope you enjoy the course, meet some friends, and gain a fresh perspective on our ever-changing world.

The Bluestocking Team

Represented by Kelly, Michelle and Sky

Table of Contents

The Bluestocking Institute is a Perth-based non-profit organisation that encourages and fosters dialogue on issues of global importance including peace building, sustainable development, and social movements. Its purpose is to inform and inspire people to become active and engaged citizens in their local communities and beyond.

Session 1: Introducing 'Globalisation'

In the initial session, along with getting to know each other, we will delve into the meanings and origins of globalisation. The term has been used in a variety of ways to refer to a range of processes, from describing how it is possible for Coke to be sold in a small tribal village in Costa Rica to justifying the need for a 'world government'. In the session we will explore the various faces of globalisation, the debates which surround it, and 'movements' which have opposed its current trajectory.

Discussion questions:

- ➢ What is globalisation and when did it begin?
- ➢ What are some of the arguments for and against globalisation?
- ➢ How has globalisation shaped your life?

Suggested readings:

Notes from Nowhere. (2003). Global day of action: N30- shut down the WTO. In *We Are Everywhere* pp. 204-207. London: Verso. Available at:
http://artactivism.gn.apc.org/allpdfs/204-%5BGDA%5DShut%20Down%20the%20WTO.pdf

Shahdad Naghshpour, S. (2008) *Globalisation: Is it good or bad?* Unpublished work. Available at: http://globalization.icaap.org/content/special/Naghshpour.html

Reading questions:

- ➢ When did you first become aware of globalisation? How and why?
- ➢ What aspect of globalisation seems particularly relevant to you?

Primary facilitators: Sky Croeser (Curtin University) and Kelly Gerard (UWA)

Session 2: The Global Economy

In this session we will explore the role of multinational companies and the way in which markets and economies have become interlinked, such that financial crises have become regional and global concerns. We will examine how production networks have become global and how this has fuelled China's economic expansion, now the world's factory. Finally, participants will be invited to share their ideas and experiences of Australia's mining boom and our place in the global economy.

Discussion questions:

➢ Can trade be free? Can trade be fair?
➢ Is someone accountable for the Global Financial Crisis? If so, who?
➢ Will the European Union exist in 10 years?

Suggested readings:

Admati, A. (2012, May 14). What Jamie Dimon won't tell you. *The Huffington Post*. Available at:
http://artactivism.gn.apc.org/allpdfs/204-%5BGDA%5DShut%20Down%20the%20WTO.pdf

Song, L. (2010, February 23). The scale of China's economic impact. *East Asia Forum*. Available at:
http://www.eastasiaforum.org/2010/02/23/the-scale-of-chinas-economic-impact/
-This article is included in the reader.

Stiglitz, J. (2007). The global economy (interview). In N. Shaikh (ed.) *The Present as History: Critical Perspectives on Global Power* pp. 54-67. New York: Columbia University Press. Available at:
http://www2.gsb.columbia.edu/faculty/jstiglitz/download/papers/2007_Global_Economy_interview.pdf

Reading questions:

➢ Do you try to purchase Australian-made goods? What is the impact of this purchasing decision?
➢ Did the Global Financial Crisis have an impact on you? How?
➢ What are some of the disadvantages to the Australian mining boom? How could these be addressed?

Primary facilitator: Kelly Gerard (UWA)

Session 3: The Environment

The third session will explore the impact of globalisation on the environment and on our patterns of consumption. Firstly, we will explore issues surrounding climate change, including the difficulties involved in forming international agreements, Australia's response and strategies, and our supposed 'greenhouse mafia'. From here we will look at some of the global solutions to climate change, from solar panels in Bangladesh, to dams in China, and controversial nuclear projects around the world. Finally, participants are invited to discuss and share their knowledge of local (and global) movements which are attempting to address environmental issues, such as protecting endangered species, re-forestation and organic 'slow food' consumption.

Discussion questions:

  ➢ How do your everyday actions have global environmental impact? (e.g. driving to work, buying your groceries, throwing out waste…)
  ➢ Does Australia have more or less responsibility to act on Climate Change than other countries, such as China? the Pacific Islands? the US?
  ➢ What impact might the Carbon Tax have?

Suggested readings:

Greenpeace. (2006). *Eating Up the Amazon*. The Netherlands: Greenpeace International. Available at:
http://www.greenpeace.org/usa/Global/usa/report/2010/2/eating-up-the-amazon.pdf

Moss, J. (2009, December 10). Who should pay for climate change? *The Age*. Available at: http://www.theage.com.au/opinion/society-and-culture/who-should-pay-for-climate-change-20091210-km0h.html
-This article is included in the reader.

Australian Geographic. (2011). *The Climate Change Front Line*. Sydney: Australian Geographic. Available at: http://www.australiangeographic.com.au/journal/on-the-frontline-climate-change-in-the-south-pacific.htm

Reading questions:

  ➢ How has world public opinion about 'the environment' changed over your lifetime? How and why have issues, such deforestation, become of global concern?
  ➢ Do less industrialised countries have a right to 'catch up' to more industrialised countries, if this means creating more air pollution?
  ➢ How has climate change been used as a 'political football'? How does this affect our ability to act?

Primary facilitator: Michelle Hackett (University of Adelaide)

Session 4: Nationalism and Identity

In the fourth session we will ask whether globalisation is more likely to lead to a less tolerant and less diverse world, or alternatively, to a more harmonious, more cosmopolitan 'global village'? Terrorism, anti–asylum seekers sentiments and rising religious intolerance point to the likelihood of the former, but greater environmental awareness, economic interdependence and international communication are also mixed in the pot. How has nationalism and changing 'identity' impacted on these global trends?

Discussion questions:

➢ How do you think the 9/11 terrorist attacks changed the world (or how people saw the world)?
➢ Why do you think asylum seekers, often referred to as 'boat people', have become such a volatile subject in Australia?
➢ Are we heading towards a more nationalist or a more cosmopolitan world?

Suggested readings:

Clyne, M. (2002). Saving us from them: the discourse of exclusion. *M/C: A Journal of Media and Culture*, 5(5). Available at: http://journal.media-culture.org.au/0210/Clyne.php
-This article is included in the reader.

Permani, R. (2011, February 26). Aid to Indonesian Islamic schools helps undermine terrorism. *East Asia Forum*. Available at:
http://www.eastasiaforum.org/2011/02/26/aid-to-indonesian-islamic-schools-helps-undermine-terrorism/

Kaplinsky, R. (2008). Globalisation, inequality and climate change: what difference does China make? *Geography Compass*, 2(1), pp. 67-78. Available at:
http://www.umsl.edu/~naumannj/professional%20geography%20articles/Globalisation,%20Inequality%20and%20Climate%20Change%20-%20What%20Difference%20Does%20China%20Make.pdf

Reading questions:

➢ Does the formation of the European Union represent an unprecedented change in global politics, from a history of war-mongering to a future of cooperation?
➢ Has Australia's identity become more multicultural or more nationalist over the last decade?
➢ Is globalisation leading to a more integrated and tolerant world, or are we seeing a backlash, with more racism, terrorism etc?

Primary facilitator: Michelle Hackett (University of Adelaide)

Session 5: New Media

The final session will explore the way that the Internet is challenging and changing existing news media, and the political effects that this is having. We'll begin by looking at key changes to journalism, including the emergence of Wikileaks and the Murdoch and Packers' attempts to protect their turf. From there we'll move on to examining changes in how people around the world *access* media: the mobile Web, the growth of blogging, and the use of social networking sites like Facebook and Twitter to follow important events. We'll end by inviting participants to discuss their own experiences with the changing media landscape and how this has influenced their understanding of global politics and social issues.

Discussion questions:

➢ Where do you get most of your news (which type of media, which channels)?
➢ Does media centralisation (and its control by media magnates) affect news reporting in Australia?
➢ How has the Internet changed journalism and politics?

Suggested readings:

Notes from Nowhere. (2003). Indymedia: Don't hate the media, be the media. In *We Are Everywhere*, pp. 228-43. London: Verso. Available at:
http://artactivism.gn.apc.org/allpdfs/228-Indymedia.pdf

Dzodan, F. (2011). Why the News of the World Scandal is about you, no matter where you live. *Tiger Beatdown Blog*. Available at:
 http://tigerbeatdown.com/2011/07/13/why-the-news-of-the-world-scandal-is-about-you-no-matter-where-you-live/
-This article is included in the reader.

Hirschkind, C. (2010). New media and political dissent in Egypt. *Revista de Dialectología y Tradiciones Populares, LXV* (1), pp. 137-154. Available at:
http://rdtp.revistas.csic.es/index.php/rdtp/article/download/93/94

Reading questions:

➢ Were you surprised by the extent of Murdoch's media holdings?
➢ What role has new media played in recent political unrest, including the riots in Britain?
➢ Does the rise of independent online media sources, such as Crikey, YouTube, Wikileaks, change the kinds of news covered, or the ways in which it is covered?

Primary facilitator: Sky Croeser (Curtin University)

Reading for Session 2: The Global Economy

Song, L. (2010, February 23). The scale of China's economic impact. *East Asia Forum*. Available at:
http://www.eastasiaforum.org/2010/02/23/the-scale-of-chinaseconomic-impact/.

The scale of China's economic impact

China has succeeded in moving up the ladder of development through rapid growth in just three decades. The pace of China's growth is not what is unique — Korea, Singapore and other economies in East Asia grew as fast in the 1970s and 1980s. What is unprecedented historically is its scale. The size of China's population, market and geography, and the dynamism that flowed from economic reform and transformation are what define its impact on the rest of the world. Despite a still relatively low per capita income, the sheer size of the Chinese economy has made China a significant player in world production, consumption, trade and increasingly international finance and the environment.

The dynamics unleashed by Deng's reform, the opening up policies and institutional changes have propelled continuous capital accumulation, productivity gains, trade and income growth on a scale the world has never seen before. China, by many measures still a developing country, became the world's largest international trader in 2009. A central question now is whether Chinese growth over the next 20 to 30 years on this, or even a more modest scale, can be sustained, given the significant impact it will have on the domestic as well as global economic and politics.

The consensus is that the Chinese economy will continue to expand at an annual rate of 6 to 8 per cent in real terms for the next twenty years (2010-30). There are other more bullish, and of course more conservative projections. But even growth at the consensus rate over the next twenty years would make China the largest economy in the world with per capita incomes perhaps four or five times as high as they are currently. China's nearly 1.5 billion people on this trajectory are set to join the richer people in the world.

There are many challenges to achieving the consensus goal of long term growth.

First, the one child policy and the impact of income growth on fertility will see China's demographic structure rapidly age. Aging of the population will constrain the supply of labour, put pressure on wages, reduce the capacity to save, change industrial structure and the composition of trade, and make building human

capital, accelerating technological change and raising productivity more urgent national priorities.

Second, China is entering a stage of growth in which the relationship between an increment in output and an increment in demand for energy and metals is exceptionally strong, This will add pressure to balancing global supply of, and demand for, resources and energy products. The impact on world markets for energy and resources is likely to be intense.

Third, and a related issue, China will have to move more rapidly towards a low-carbon growth economy. This will require accelerating the pace of change in industrial structure, and a faster pace of technological innovation in the energy-using sector of the economy than was achieved in the industrialisation of already-developed economies. The policy commitments towards this goal are still being put in place.

Fourth, in the next twenty years, China will not be able to rely on the economic model that drove growth over the past two decades. That model saw the emergence of unsustainable current account imbalances. The next phase of growth requires a strategy of domestic market integration and internally driven development. And it requires a China actively involved in global cooperation to achieve balanced growth in the global economy, so important already are the effects of China's strategies on the international economic system.

Fifth, China also needs to deal with the income inequality and regional disparities that have grown in the course of rapid growth. Failure to deal with domestic inequalities will threaten social stability in the next phase of growth and development.

Finally, China's rise as a global economic powerhouse will thrust on it the mantle of increasing responsibilities in global affairs, requiring it to contribute positively to global stability, progress and prosperity through cooperation with other players in the global economic system. This is not merely a question of how China manages its external economic relations but a question also of how it conducts itself politically.

If China succeeds in meeting these challenges, the coming couple of decades will see it elevated to a position of global primacy, or at least 'co-primacy' alongside the United States.

Success is more easily presumed than achieved. A smooth Chinese ascendancy to global primacy, both for China and the rest of the world, will need many changes from the status quo.

For China, perhaps the most important challenge will be confronting the task of comprehensive institutional reform — in the economic system, in governance, as

well as in the political system. Failure to proceed with comprehensive institutional reform will jeopardise continuing growth and the global market integration and stability of which it is based. It also risks various forms of economic dislocation at home as well as social instability which will disrupt the growth process and negatively impact on the global economy.

Without economic, structural and political adjustments in the rest of the world to China's rise, there will be economic and political tensions that will frustrate, though likely not prevent the redistribution of power in the world economy.

China is still well short of the point in the process of economic development where its growth might be expected to slow or the energy, resource and carbon intensity of growth to recede. Rapid manufacturing-led growth is expected to persist for some time whatever indicators of success are used — the projected increase in China's per capita income, auto penetration, metals and energy intensity, capital stock per capita or the level of urbanisation.

Yet the momentum of growth at its current pace, even that maintained through the global financial crisis, is unlikely to be sustained in the medium term without addressing these big issues of development strategy — structural and institutional reform; the unwinding of imbalances and government fiscal measures to boost the economy. Unattended to, there are likely to be lower rates of economic growth in the next few years. A global environment in which carbon constraints become increasingly binding will also lower the growth trajectory in the medium term.

Enhancing technological progress holds one key to China's long term growth success. There is huge potential for China to narrow the technological gap between it and the mature industrialised economies, particularly in the area of green technologies. Government will play a crucial role. With the effort and investment made by the government, it may well be that China will catch up more quickly and could even assume leadership in the application of green technologies, particularly considering the economies of scale associated with their use in China's projected mega-market, its strong foundation of human capital and determination to adopt a new model for economic growth. A concerted effort to generate and commercialise environmentally sound technology would enable China to quicken the pace of industrial structural change and alter the current trajectory of its industrialisation, laying a more solid foundation for its goal of long term growth.

As in the past thirty years, the market must also play a crucial role and development of market integrity alongside the role of the state will be at the core of the challenge for China in achieving its ambitions for development.

Ligang Song is Associate Professor and director of the China Economy Program at the Crawford School of Economics and Government, Australian National University.

Reading for Session 3: The Environment

Moss, J. (2009, December 10). Who should pay for climate change? *The Age*. Available at: http://www.theage.com.au/opinion/society-and-culture/who-should-pay-for-climate-change-20091210-km0h.html

Who should pay for climate change?

Action on climate change is set to increase prices for basic necessities, for which the poor should not have to bear the brunt.

The Copenhagen summit has highlighted the political sensitivities surrounding who will end up paying for climate change. The science has told us what we need to do, but governments are still struggling with the political questions.

In one sense, the politics of climate change should give us pause. In our efforts to avoid or reduce the more damaging effects of climate change we need to ensure that the burden falls on the right groups of people. What this suggests is that the problem of how to distribute the costs of climate change is fundamentally a problem of justice.

Adopting a collective political response is important because we need to avoid some of the pitfalls of leaving decisions at a purely personal level. For instance, we are often told that our response to climate change should lead us to change our behaviour: that we should adopt low emissions lifestyles; install extensive solar panels; buy local food; become a green consumer and so on. These are undoubtedly good things for the environment. But the danger associated with this approach is that such a response to climate change remains in the realm of personal ethics (for those who can afford it) and does not provide a fair allocation of costs.

When we do take a collective response, the poor may suffer most. Carbon taxes, flat rate energy and fuel price rises affect the poor more than the rich. All these measures might be the most efficient, but without adjustments, the social justice outcomes may be inadequate.

But it is not just the local poor who may suffer if we are not careful. Assuming that developing countries will bear at least some of the burden, how they distribute the costs domestically will also be important. For instance, in 2008 China had 419,000 people worth more than $US1 million, which is a large amount relative to the average income in China. Just as Australia's wealthy may not bear their share, the world's rich may also pay less.

So we have two dimensions to this problem that need to be avoided: how to get the necessary global agreement that doesn't harm the global poor, (while letting the wealthy off) while also not harming the industrial poor who are badly off, relatively speaking. To answer this question we need to understand the reasons why anyone should have an obligation to pay in the first place.

We might look at the problem in terms of whose fault it is. The "you broke it, you fix it" approach is exactly the sort of principle that many have thought appropriate for addressing the costs of climate change. If someone has taken unfair advantage of someone else, then they should pay the costs of fixing any harms. And, as most of the change that we are experiencing now is a result of the "dirty industrialisation" of the developed world in the past 100 years, the burdens of mitigation should fall on the already industrialised.

The most obvious objection to this sort of view is that people were ignorant of the harm that they were causing when they directly or indirectly produced emissions. In countries like Australia, few could now claim that they are now unaware that using electricity from coal-fired power stations causes harmful effects. But given that the bulk of the emissions that have caused today's climate change were emitted before people could reasonably be expected to have known about the effects of what they were doing, it is at least plausible to argue that responsibility for the emissions might be reduced.

Perhaps ignorance doesn't matter. Maybe it is enough to know that even if people had known what they were doing they would have done the same thing. Nonetheless, we may be better off looking for a different reason for paying than you or your country's historical link to climate change.

One argument comes from the compelling fact that its better to live in Britain than Bangladesh. Two centuries of economic development and industrialisation give a Westerner a quality of life that is on average far better than our poorer neighbours'.

If this is true, those who have benefited from the industrialisation and the accompanying carbon dioxide emissions should foot the bill. This way of thinking also solves the "dead polluters" problem. If you are a citizen of a developed polluting country then you have inherited its benefits (a good life) and its burdens (pollution debt).

But if benefiting is the reason that countries have for paying, this must raise the question of who benefits, and here we are back to the poor.

While it is true that it is better to be born in a wealthy country, it is truer for some than for others. For instance, indigenous people have not received anything like their share of Australia's prosperity. This point generalises to other disadvantaged groups. The long term unemployed and those with a disability have often been left

out of prosperity. Indeed, inequality has grown in the past decade even though wealth has increased.

Countries that are asked to pay war reparations are an analogous example. For example, where a country defeated in a war has reparations imposed upon it, this can lead to the wrong people having to pay the reparations, people who were children at the time of the war for instance. In such a situation, it may be justified for people in a defeated country to pay some costs for reconstruction but not because they were part of a state that caused the war.

Any likely just outcome will include elements of each of these responses. But taken alone, they are too imprecise and messy to be a guide.

A more productive way to approach these issues is to argue that those countries that can pay should do so. A global country-based system of combatting climate change that is funded by those who can pay would avoid many of the pitfalls of historical and benefit approaches.

The reason is that there is something wrong about those with the resources not paying for such an urgent problem when they can. Those in wealthy countries have an additional reason to pay given that they already use their fair share of the atmosphere's potential as a carbon sink.

Moreover, the reasons that some people have for enjoying extra opportunities to use the atmosphere as a carbon sink – they industrialised first, had the good luck to be born in developed countries as opposed to poor ones and so on – are plausibly not good reasons because they are morally arbitrary.

What we should conclude from this is that the urgency of responding to climate change should not blind us to the likely impact of our response on the already disadvantaged.

Dr Jeremy Moss is the director of the Social Justice Initiative at the University of Melbourne and the editor of Climate Change and Social Justice, MUP.

Reading for Session 4: Nationalism and Identity

Clyne, M. (2002). Saving us from them: the discourse of exclusion. *M/C: A Journal of Media and Culture*, 5(5). Available at: http://journal.media-culture.org.au/0210/Clyne.php.

Saving Us From Them: The Discourse of Exclusion

The public discourse on asylum seekers in the past year or so and the generation of hatred against them contains a strong linguistic element marking clear boundaries between 'ourselves' and the asylum seekers. I will discuss this linguistic dimension, which calls for vigilance and critical awareness in future discourses of exclusion.

One of John Howard's political platforms in the victorious campaign, in which he replaced Paul Keating as Prime Minister was to liberate Australia of the 'political correctness' imposed by his opponents. In this respect, at least, he came close to the far right in Australian politics. For instance, he said of far right ex-Labor Independent Graeme Campbell: 'His attacks on political correctness echo many of the attacks I made on political correctness' (The Age, 18 June 1996). 'Political correctness' is a negative term for 'inclusive language' -- avoiding or being encouraged by stylistic or policy guidelines to avoid the choice of lexical items that may be offensive to sections of the population. The converse is the discourse of exclusion. Whether it excludes on the basis of ethnicity, religion, gender or any other basis, the discourse of exclusion creates a division between 'us' and 'them', partly on the basis of different lexical items for the two groups (Clyne, Establishing Linguistic Markers of Racism).

Asylum seekers have been projected by politicians (especially those in the government) as not only different from the Australian people and therefore not belonging, but also as a threat to the Australian people. To demonstrate this projection it is worth considering some of the terms and formulations of exclusion and division that have been used. As Mungo MacCallum argues, 'The first step was to get rid of the term 'refugee'; it has a long and honourable history and is generally used to describe people forced to flee from their homelands.' It might be more accurate to say that the government limited its use so that no honourable associations could be made with the current group of asylum seekers. There had been newspaper columns which had focused on the achievements and contributions to the nation of previous vintages of refugees; some communities consisted largely or entirely of refugees and their descendants, including some who had given longstanding support to the Liberal Party. The semantic narrowing of 'refugee' was illustrated in the Prime Minister's pronouncement (Herald-Sun, 8 Oct. 2001) when

it was alleged that asylum seekers had thrown their children overboard: 'Genuine refugees don't do that'. Thus, refugee status in the public discourse was being related to their moral representation and not to any consideration of the threat of persecution in their homeland. While refugee status was officially a legal issue, when the Prime Minister interacted with the media and the voters, the asylum seekers were already excluded by guided popular opinion, for 'I don't want people like that in Australia'. The exclusionary line based on moral grounds was echoed by Alexander Downer (The Age, 8 Oct. 2001), who described the asylum seekers as lacking the civilized behaviour to be worthy to live in Australia: 'Any civilized person wouldn't dream of treating their own children that way'.

So what could the asylum seekers be called? MacCallum (2002: 43) attributes to Philip Ruddock the verbal masterstroke' of reducing the identification of the asylum seekers to a 'one word label': 'unlawful'. However, this identification came in a number of facets. They were described on both sides of parliament as 'illegals', illegal arrivals', 'illegal immigrants' (e.g. Hansard, 29 Aug. 2001). All of these terms encourage the view of intrusion. In actual fact, whether people's arrival had been authorized by the government or not, there is no such thing as an 'illegal refugee'. Other descriptions ranged from 'occasional tourists' (Gary Hardgrave, Minister for Citizenship and Multicultural Affairs; House of Representatives, 30 Aug. 2001) '; to 'café latte poor' (Senator Robert Ray, former Labor Minister for Immigration), which assumes that only the poor can be refugees. Such descriptions suggested that the asylum seekers were dishonest imposters. But the term 'illegals' lowers asylum seekers to the status of 'non-people' and this gives others the licence to treat them in a way that may be different to those who are 'people'. This is reinforced by the fact that the asylum seekers are neither nice nor poor, and therefore cannot expect to attract support from the government (and, to a large extent from the opposition).

The 'bully' image of the asylum seekers was propagated by comments on the behaviour of those allegedly harming their children, described by Ruddock as 'carefully planned and premeditated' (The Age, 14 Feb. 2002). It was reinforced by Peter Reith, who described the action as a 'premeditated attempt to force their way into the country' (The Age, 8 Aug. 2001).

When Kim Beazley said: 'It is not unhumanitarian (sic) to try to deter criminals' (The Age, 8 Nov. 2001), he left it to our imagination or choice whether, in supporting the government's position, he wanted to defend us from the asylum seekers or from the 'people smugglers' of whom they are victims. However he put the asylum seekers directly or by association into the criminal category. The suggestion that the asylum seekers might be economic migrants masquerading as refugees enabled the government to differentiate them from 'battlers', who are likely to support action against any 'crooks' who will take the little the battlers have away from them.

So far asylum seekers as 'bad cruel people' have been differentiated from 'genuine refugees' of the past, from a nation of 'civilized', gentle, child-loving people, and from Aussie 'battlers'. 'Queue-jumper' is a term that differentiates asylum seekers from both the 'mainstream' and the succession of migrants who have come at various times. This term occurs in several debates (used e.g. by Senator Ron Boswell and Kay Ellison, 29 Aug. 2001). Firstly, it invokes the twin cultural concepts of fairness and orderliness. The 'destruction' of 'political correctness' and especially Pauline Hanson's expressed views regenerated the notion that the needy were unfairly getting something for nothing that others had to work for. This included Aborigines, recently arrived migrants or refugees, single mothers, and even the disabled. The fact that there were no queues in Iraq, Afghanistan, Iran, or the Palestinian Territories in which people could stand to fill in immigration applications was not taken into account.

Queuing is very much an Anglo concept of orderliness, reflecting the strong linear emphasis in British-derived cultures, even in academic discourse and school essays and in formal meetings as I have discussed elsewhere (e.g. Clyne, Inter-cultural Communication at Work). In another sense, the 'queue jumper' is a repugnant person to migrants of all backgrounds. The impression is gained from the designation that asylum seekers are taking the place in a tight quota of their relatives (or people like them) waiting to be admitted under the family reunion scheme. In actual fact, the number of asylum seekers recognized as refugees does not affect other categories such as family reunion, and in fact, the quota for the humanitarian category wasn't nearly filled in 2001.

The government's handling of asylum seekers is thus underpinned by two types of moral principles -- the schoolmaster principle -- They have to behave themselves, otherwise they will be punished, and the schoolchild principle (based on the perception)-- It ain't fair; he pushed in.

Another term that has played an important role in the asylum seeker discourse is 'border protection'. This term featured prominently in the 2001 election campaign, when both major parties vied to persuade voters that they were best equipped to protect Australia. It lives on in the public discourse and relates both to contemporary international politics and to traditional Australian xenophobia. The 2001 federal election was fought in the context of the terrorist attacks on the twin towers and the American-led coalition against international terrorism. Thus, the term 'border protection' was necessarily ambiguous. Was it terrorists or asylum seekers who were being kept out? Or were they perhaps the same people? Even though many of the asylum seekers were claiming to be escaping from persecution by the terrorists or those who were harbouring them. Maybe the linking association is with Islam? It is possible that 'border protection' (like the Liberal Party's 1998

election slogan 'For all of us') is also ambiguous enough to attract opponents of multiculturalism without alienating its supporters.

Boat-loads of new arrivals have long caused fear among Australians. For much of Australia's British history, we were terrified of invasions from our north -- not just the 'yellow peril', it even included the Russians and the French, from whom Australians were protected by fortresses along the coast. This was immortalized in the final verse of the politically incorrect early version of Advance Australia Fair:

Should foreign foe e'er sight our coast
Or dare a foot to land,
We'll rouse to arms like siers of yore
To guard our native strand;
Brittania then shall surely know,
Beyond wide oceans roll
Her sons in fair Australia's land
Still keep a British soul,
In joyful strains, etc.

In fact, the entire original version of Advance Australia Fair has a predominantly exclusionist theme which contrasts with the inclusive values embodied in the present national anthem. While our 'politically correct' version has 'boundless plains to share' with 'those who've come across the seas', they are only open to 'loyal sons' in the original, which is steeped in colonial jingoism. The gender-inclusive 'Australians all' replaces 'Australia's sons' as the opening appellation. Are our politicians leading us back from an inclusive and open identity?

I do not have space to go into the opposing discourse, which has come largely from academic social scientists, former prime ministers, and ministers of both major parties, current politicians of the minor parties, and journalists from the broadsheet press and the ABC. Objections are often raised against the 'demonisation' and 'dehumanisation' of the asylum seekers. In this short article, I have tried to demonstrate the techniques used to do this. The use of 'illegal' and 'queue jumper' to represent asylum seekers differentiates them from 'refugees' and 'migrants' and has removed them from any category with whom existing Australians should show solidarity. What makes them different is that they are cruel, even to their children, dishonest and imposters, badly behaved, unfair and disorderly – enemies of the Australian people, who want to deprive them of their sovereignty. It is interesting to see this in contrast to the comment of a spokesperson from Rural Australians for Refugees (AM, Radio National, 26 Jan. 2002): 'We can't recognise our country anymore which was based on fairness and fair go'.

Reading for Session 5: New Media

Dzodan, F. (2011, July 13). Why the News of the World Scandal is about you, no matter where you live. *Tiger Beatdown Blog*. Available at: http://tigerbeatdown.com/2011/07/13/why-the-news-of-the-world-scandal-is-about-you-no-matter-where-you-live/.

Why the News of the World scandal is about you, no matter where you live

Chances are that you have heard there is a corruption scandal currently unfolding in the UK. This scandal involves the tabloid News of the World, one of the most popular and far reaching in Britain.

Leave it to Wikipedia to provide a handy short summary of the events timeline:

The controversy began in 2006, when the Metropolitan Police laid charges against Clive Goodman, the News of the World's royal editor, and Glenn Mulcaire, a private investigator, alleging that they intercepted voicemail messages left for members of the royal household. Both men were jailed in 2007. Allegations against the News of the World in relation to illegal voicemail interceptions have continued in subsequent years, implicating other journalists and staff at the paper; numerous public figures, including politicians and celebrities, were found to have been targeted by the interceptions.

The Metropolitan Police began a new investigation into phone hacking allegations in February 2011, at which time more than 20 civil cases against the News of the World were also active. Attorneys for the victims allege that as many as 7,000 people had their phones hacked by the News of the World, and have estimated that litigation over the paper's actions may cost News Corporation £40 million.

In July 2011, further allegations were made that the News of the World hacked into the voicemails of murder victim Milly Dowler, as well as victims of the 7/7 attacks and relatives of deceased British soldiers. The news was met with public outrage in the United Kingdom. Advertisers withdrew from the News of the World and other News Corporation holdings, and the company's proposed acquisition of the broadcaster BSkyB was seriously threatened.

On 6 July, British prime minister David Cameron announced to parliament that a public government inquiry would convene to further investigate the affair. The

following day, James Murdoch announced that the newspaper would shut down on Sunday, 10 July 2011, after 168 years of publication.

Now, the scandal has spread to include another News Corporation newspaper, The Sun. According to the latest allegations, The Sun obtained Gordon Brown's (former British Prime Minister) financial history, the details of his son's medical condition (which at the time were private), his voice mails and even access to his personal bank account, which were all used to exhort pressure on the British government and political influence. British media is coming to terms with the fact that, from the looks of it, public figures were simply pawns in News Corp's political games. Allegations of blackmail, illegal lobbying and trafficking of influences abound.

To the general public, all of this might seem very domestically British, very distant and while certainly a political misfortune, a series of events that hold little weight for the rest of us, non British residents. Except that our every day lives, no matter where we are, what our socio economic background is, are shaped by this scandal. Because you see, News Corp is owned by Rupert Murdoch, the man you can hold accountable for not being able to access an abortion provider. The man you can hold accountable for the increase of intolerance and xenophobia sweeping the entirety of the Western World. Rupert Murdoch, the man who gave us Sarah Palin's political career, Gert Wilders international fame, the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq, the erosion of civil rights presented as a necessity and the demonization of Islam and the Middle East. Rupert Murdoch, the man who owns your mass media.

When AskMen.com publishes an article stating that women should be "shamed" into losing weight, thank Rupert Murdoch.

Anchor babies and the demonization of immigrant women? Thank Rupert Murdoch.

Act like a lady, think like a man and the pervasive stereotyping of gender and "how women should behave"? Thank Rupert Murdoch.

The rise of the Tea Party and the mainstream radicalization of the Western world? Thank Rupert Murdoch.

The constant portrayal of immigrants, asylum seekers, refuges and economic migrants as a threat to Western values? Thank Rupert Murdoch.

Because, in case you weren't aware (and there is a conscious effort to obscure these facts), Rupert Murdoch owns a significant, influencing, far reaching media empire. His outlets include (but are not limited to):

Publishing house HarperCollins
Film Studio (and subsidiaries) 20th Century Fox
Fox News (and all subsidiaries)

Cable TV networks Sky Italia and Sky Germany
AskMen.com
Dow Jones & Company
The Wall Street Journal

(I urge you to check the link above to gasp at the extent of News Corp reach and influence).

Now, I am not going to be so naive as to blame the Murdoch media empire for all the ills in the world. But let me clear: it might not be the sole responsible actor in our current sad state of affairs but it has played a very significant, prominent role in it. The Murdoch empire has been the necessary media machinery that relentlessly worked to undermine our rights, our social progress, our autonomy and even our bodies. Since 9/11, the steady radicalization of international politics, the attack on progressive ideas, the constant portrayal of LGBTQ issues as a threat, the raise of the extreme Christian right and the increasing rhetoric of war and hatred have gone hand in hand with an ideology pushed by media outlets owned by Rupert Murdoch.

The News of the World scandal, as domestic as it might seem at first sight, only proves the pattern of corruption and relentless pursuit of ideological warfare that has been imposed on all of us. No matter our place in the world, our lives are touched by the spread of these bombastic ideas and the peddling of political measures that affect our livelihood and our well being. It is high time these outlets are exposed and singled out as the hate mongers they are. Because the media we have been consuming for the past ten years has been actively working against us and we should be well aware of who's the man behind it.

This blog was written by Flavia Dzodan. Posted on Wednesday, July 13, 2011, at 7:43 am.

                    END OF BOOKLET