

Australian hospitality: Overseas Information Campaigns and the 'theatricalised' encounter

Ben Hightower

For whom is the border a friction-free zone of entitled access, a frontier of possibility? Who travels confidently across borders, and who gets questioned, detained, interrogated, and strip-searched at the border? (Conquergood 2002: 145)

The preface of a handbook delivered to refugees and holders of humanitarian visas currently overseas and selected for settlement in Australia ends with the words 'Australia is a wonderful place, full of opportunities and new experiences ... WELCOME TO AUSTRALIA' (DIAC 2011).¹ This handbook, given in conjunction with the Australian Cultural Orientation (AUSCO) program, is the 'beginning of the settlement process for people coming to Australia under the Humanitarian Program' (DIAC 2012). The 'official welcome' is given to each person before they ever arrive in the country. The capitalisation of 'WELCOME TO AUSTRALIA' at the end of the message signifies its point: 'Be welcome here'.

The word 'welcome', as it is commonly used today expresses something that is considered pleasurable, acceptable or freely permitted; perhaps a 'welcomed change' or a 'welcomed guest'. Certainly this meaning is conveyed in the usage above, but what welcome awaits the people who have not been preselected, that is, those who have not been chosen or invited to come to Australia? What of the refugees and

asylum seekers who travel by their own ways and means – as is their legal right – to seek protection in a country outside their own? Upon closer investigation it becomes clear that the message in the AUSCO handbook indicates something further; something more precise or particular about the Australian welcome.

The word ‘welcome’ comes from the Old English *wilcuma* which literally means, ‘one whose coming is in accord with another’s will’ (Online Etymology Dictionary: 2013). This etymology points to another significant point of the welcome: it is an invitational and therefore, conditional welcome. The conditions of that welcome stems from the host’s will; it announces: ‘Be welcome here. *You* have been invited’. As such, it differentiates between those with and those without an official invitation. This of course *is* the Government’s will, as former prime minister John Howard infamously decreed, ‘We will decide who comes to this country and the circumstances in which they come’ (Howard 2001). Howard’s words and the particular *will* located therein have echoed through Australian migration policy ever since.

In 2012, the Department of Immigration and Citizenship (hereafter DIAC) sent a ‘clear message’²² to ‘unannounced’ asylum seekers that was indeed *unwelcoming*:

Don’t risk your family’s safety or your money.

- Don’t risk your family’s safety or your money by paying people smugglers. Arriving in Australia by boat means:
- no guarantee of resettlement in Australia
- claims will not be processed faster than those arriving the right way
- high chance of being transferred to Nauru or Manus Island for processing
- waiting to be resettled can sometimes take many years - even if your family are found to be refugees
- they won’t be able to get a family reunion visa (under the humanitarian program)
- your family may be kept in detention or be placed in the

Hightower

community with no work rights.³

It should be noted that nowhere in this message is it mentioned that people cannot *legally* come to Australia by boat. However, in bold text the Government suggests that coming to Australia is a ‘risk’ both physically and financially. Specifically, the message is a warning that people who come to Australia by boat are susceptible to these types of risks. While this might be true, this is not the point I am highlighting here. Shifting away from the warning, the message continues to illustrate an ‘unwelcoming’ attitude towards these particular types of entrants, listing the different ways that a person will be penalised for seeking asylum by boat: they might not be able to settle in Australia, they will be detained and have limited rights and during this whole process they will intentionally be kept away from their families. Again, the Government makes no mention that it is illegal for a refugee to seek asylum by boat – and that is because in fact, it is not illegal.⁴ Instead, it is simply suggested that seeking asylum by boat is not the ‘right way’ to come to Australia. The Government has reinforced this belief by developing a ‘humanitarian’ system that not only discourages, but penalises people from seeking asylum in this way.

Unmistakably, messages like the one above are not just a list of the ‘facts’ which chart all the ways the law will affect those arriving by boat. The message (and the many more like it) also contains an implicit threat, namely, that ‘these are all the terrible things we will do to you people if you come here’. While these seem like strong words, they are no exaggeration: The Government has said that the creation of ‘tough new laws’ in the ‘humanitarian scheme’ of its migration system is as much about deterrence as anything else.⁵ Through the use of grim and rhetorical statements like the one on the DIAC website, the Government attempts to create specific types of encounters at the border with asylum seekers and refugees – or perhaps put more correctly, they attempt to avoid certain types of encounters at the border. This clearly reveals something about the Australian Government’s will – that it is based on an *unwelcoming* attitude towards the uninvited ‘guest’. In other words, while the Government may gladly welcome the people it

expects or selects to arrive at its border, it shows a total lack of *hospitality* towards the uninvited other who shows up at their doorstep.

1 Hospitality and Border Theatre: setting the scene

Hospitality is a term used to describe the relationship between ‘guest’ and ‘host’. In the West, it commonly refers to the reception and treatment offered to guests and usually indicates a certain level of etiquette or respect shown on behalf of the host. As a theoretical approach, hospitality provides a way to question or challenge the traditional roles of guest and host. Similarly, it also allows for an inquiry into the modern rights and privileges of each participant. Here, this includes the relationship between refugees (as guest) and the State (as host).

In its response to the perceived ‘refugee problem’, the Australian Government – as a potential host for refugees – has differed from the Refugee Convention and its Protocol (as well as differing from the actions of other countries which are also signatories to the Convention). Specifically, the Australian Government has created different classes of refugees: onshore and offshore. ‘Offshore’ refugees are considered those refugees ‘over there’ in UNHCR refugee camps while ‘onshore’ refugees claim refugee status from within Australia. This is the method by which the Government created the notion of the refugee ‘queue’.⁶ Essentially, onshore applicants are considered and actively promoted as ‘unworthy’, ‘bad’ and ‘illegal’; stealing the supposed limited number of spots away from more ‘deserving’, ‘good’ and ‘legal’ refugees who are patiently waiting in camps overseas (Crock, Daul and Dastyari 2006:15-19). Specifically, the people targeted by the Government and receiving the most negative attention are the small amounts of people who seek asylum by boat. Despite instituting strict measures to deter refugees from Australian shores,⁷ this has not stopped people from seeking asylum by boat. Returning to the concepts of the ‘welcome’ and ‘hospitality’, offshore refugees preselected to come to Australia are invited and therefore, welcome into the country. In contrast, offshore refugees who come by boat – the ‘wrong way’ – are uninvited and

Hightower

therefore, unwelcome. They do not fall under Australia's so-called 'protection obligations' and therefore, are not owed hospitality.

Cosmopolitanism is offered up as a useful avenue to explore an ideal relationship between asylum-seekers and asylum-givers. According to Kant (1983: 357), cosmopolitanism includes a right to 'universal *hospitality*'. Kant bases this 'right' on the belief that each person belongs to the surface of the earth (1983: 358). As such, 'hospitality ... means the right of an alien not to be treated as an enemy upon his arrival in another's country ... as long as he behaves peaceably' (1983: 358). Following the work of Kant, Derrida (2001) demonstrates the problem inherent in cosmopolitanism, namely, the irreconcilability between unconditional and conditional hospitality. In Derrida's view, unconditional hospitality is an unachievable ideal (1999: 20-21). In short, the rationale is that without the ability to decide on the question of hospitality, the host loses the ability to offer any level of real hospitality. Derrida says that 'Hospitality is due to the foreigner, certainly, but remains, like the law, conditional, and thus conditioned in its dependence on the unconditionality that is the basis of the law' (2000: 73). Derrida does not seek to discourage by pointing out this irreconcilability. Instead, he aims to challenge others to 'transform and improve the law' by taking note if there are in fact, possibilities for improvement in the space between the 'Law of unconditional hospitality ... and the conditional laws of a right to hospitality' (2001:22). In other words, hospitality should be offered with unconditional hospitality in mind so as to achieve – as close as possible – the ethic implicit in unconditional hospitality (Derrida 1999:20-21).

However, this is not the case in Australia. It cannot be said that the country is currently striving towards an ethic of unconditional hospitality towards refugees. Instead, Australia employs a strict conditional hospitality policy that puts them firmly in a place of power and reduces the instances in which any type of welcome may be offered to the guest. This task is accomplished by removing the variety of people who can 'legally' be considered guest. These include, but are not limited to, people outside the migration zone, people without visas and people

who arrive by boat.

As mentioned above, simply changing these conditions/restrictions of entry has not definitively halted boat arrivals. In order to deter refugees and gain support domestically, Australia has utilised several Overseas Information Campaigns (hereafter OICs) to spread the message that ‘boat people’ are not welcome. The use of such campaigns is something that I would like to consider here as a creation of a ‘theatricalised’ encounter. This is not to suggest that the use of OICs is similar to theatre in ‘metaphorical terms’ or suggest that these events simply have a ‘surface likeness to theatre’ (Nield 2006: 64). Instead, as according to Nield, ‘some of the ways in which identity, space and appearance work together in the encounter at the border are similar to the ways they work together in theatre’ (2006:64). The ‘theatrical’ includes any space that is created to ‘compel certain kinds of appearance’ (2006:64). This does not mean that people or the management of borders are ‘theatrical’ in the sense that people ‘act’ or ‘pretend’ to be something they are not – at least, not necessarily. Instead the border operates ‘theatrically’ in the sense that it is the place where characters appear – ‘it is the only place where they *can* appear’ (2006: 64 Emphasis added).

Like a stage where performers are to appear, the border is also a purpose built environment to ‘stage’ certain encounters and, in turn, “produce” the individual who attempts to cross’ (Nield 2006:61). However, it is the job of OICs to ensure that ‘boat people’ do not attempt to cross the border. In a sense, the border is a space that does not actually exist – that is to say it only exists in the human imagination; it has been created by man. Nield states that ‘A place which does not exist ... is made ‘present’ through the theatrical event, whether through design and realisation, or through being described in language’ (2006:64). According to Nield, recent ‘political developments’ such as the ‘war on terror’ have led to an increase in ‘mechanisms’ which regulate migration in Europe. These mechanisms are not ‘neutral’ but instead, ‘contribute to the construction of both identity and space – to the production of theatrical space and the theatricalised encounter’

Hightower

(2006:64). Similar mechanisms have been implemented in Australia to regulate refugee movements.

The person who comes to the border must be able to represent themselves effectively; they must 'play' themselves or run the risk of being unable to pass through the border and 'disappear, both legally and performatively' (Neild 2006:65). In the case of refugees who appear at the Australian border, the Government ascertains how convincing a person is: Are they actually people in need of protection? Are they 'genuine'? However, the Australian Government tries to limit the number of these particular characters at the border; to essentially make them disappear before they ever arrive at the border.

In the next section, three successive Australian OICs are analysed. It is shown that they serve several purposes other than spreading 'information' about Australia's migration system. They clearly seek to show an inhospitable attitude and remove any possibility that a welcome can be deciphered from border. The OICs also create a type of border theatre which compels or deters certain appearances at the border.

2 Australian Overseas Information Campaigns: creating a theatricalised encounter

For some time, Australia has had the 'social practice' of deterring *others* from its border.⁸ As part of this practice of deterrence, Overseas Information Campaigns (hereafter OICs) have often been used to stage certain types of encounters with refugees. More specifically, OICs have been used to *avoid* encounters with refugees, what Crock, Daul and Dastyari consider 'dissuasion through advertising' (2006: 50). In order to 'dissuade' people from the border, OICs operate largely as 'fear campaigns'; this fear is encouraged domestically and abroad. OICs misdirect and mislead citizens about people who seek protection in their country; who they are, why they come, their rights and responsibilities (Crock, Daul and Dastyari 2006: 50) In addition, and in a variety of ways, OICs also make people who seek protection fearful of approaching the border.

The following sections of this article discuss three successive OICs that have been used by the Australian Government: the *Pay a People Smuggler and You'll Pay the Price* campaign, the *Sri Lankan 'Street Drama'* campaign and the *No To People Smuggling* social media campaign. In each example, it is demonstrated that OICs create spaces which compel certain types of refugee appearance – fearful, illegal and uncertain. In addition, it is shown that OICs are also a method by which the Government attempts to unite its citizenry against 'boat people'. Further, it shows that Australian hospitality is always conditional, and specifically, that asylum seekers and refugees when unannounced or uninvited will always be unwelcome.

A Pay a People Smuggler and You'll Pay the Price

In October 1999, two years before SIEVX sank en-route to Australia,⁹ then immigration minister Phillip Ruddock launched an Overseas Information Campaign aimed at stopping illegal entrants. Its slogan was *Pay a People Smuggler and You'll Pay the Price* (DIMA 1999b).¹⁰ According to Ruddock, publicity material was 'distributed throughout *high risk* people smuggling source countries as well as transit countries to warn people of the risks of trying to enter Australia illegally' (DIMA 1999a; emphasis added).¹¹ This material included videos, radio news clips, posters and special information kits. A media release by DIMA (1999a) stated:

Mr Ruddock said the campaign would have both an international and domestic focus. On the international front, the campaign will target would-be illegal entrants in high risk source countries, such as China, Iraq, Sri Lanka, Turkey, as well as people smugglers in transit countries such as Thailand, Indonesia, Malaysia and Papua New Guinea. 'Campaigns will be tailor made for individual countries to ensure they are culturally appropriate,' said the Minister, and include videos, radio news clips, posters and special information kits that will be translated into 12 languages. These items will be distributed to media outlets by DIMA staff on the ground. 'With today's launch,' said the Minister, 'the Australian Government is sending a clear message that we will do everything in our power to stop smugglers who trade in human cargo'.

Hightower

Ruddock reiterated: 'We will be sending a clear message that people thinking about undertaking such a trip will fail, will be ruined financially and could even die' (DIMA 1999a). Part of the campaign included video footage warning people of the dangers of coming to Australia by boat. The videos explained that people could be 'eaten alive' and 'showed open-mouthed crocodiles and sharks' (United States Committee for Refugees and Immigrants 2001). It was suggested in the video that if people survived these horrific possibilities, then they would be sent to remote detention centres and 'could be stuck in an inhospitable desert where the snakes could get them' (United States Committee for Refugees and Immigrants 2001).

Ruddock defended the necessity of the videos:

Now when you see them you might think that they are a little sensational. You may think that they're horrific, and that maybe we're trying unnecessarily to scare people from coming to Australia. So I want to stress that the information in all of these videos is based on fact (Hall 2000).

Ruddock also maintained that the videos were 'very powerful weapons against a criminal trade in human misery' (DIMA 2000). In addition, the campaign was developed to reinforce the fact that the Australian Government was 'introducing even tougher penalties for people smugglers' (DIMA 1999a).

As mentioned, the *Pay a People Smuggler and You'll Pay the Price* campaign also had a domestic focus to spread the Government's 'message'. This message was not only to warn people about the dangers of coming to Australia by boat, but also appealed to each citizen's sense of national duty to spread this message themselves. As Ruddock himself appealed:

On the domestic front, I am calling on all Australians to let their friends and relatives know that the message is clear: pay a people smuggler and you'll pay the price. People must understand that Australia *welcomes migrants - not illegal entrants* (DIMA 2000; emphasis added).

Mr Ruddock said four information leaflets had been developed to encourage migrants already in Australia to spread the message in their country of origin. The leaflets explain what happens to illegal air and boat arrivals, what the Australian Government is doing to stop arrivals, why people must help stop illegal entrants and precisely what they can each do to assist the Government. All of the leaflets, posters and information booklets have the DIMA emblem located somewhere on the material. One leaflet used as part of the OIC and distributed domestically is entitled: 'WHY YOU MUST HELP STOP ILLEGAL ENTRANTS' (DIMA 1999b). Throughout the *Pay a People Smuggler and You'll Pay the Price* OIC themes prevail that centre on 'illegal entrants' and 'people smuggling'. Nowhere in the literature are the words 'asylum seeker' or 'refugee' mentioned. Instead, the literature states 'We need to tell the people smugglers and the *potential illegal immigrants* that Australia is determined to stop those people who try to break Australia's law' (DIMA 1999b; emphasis added). The literature aims to convince Australians that the people trying to come to Australia are *potentially* illegal, instead of *potentially* being asylum seekers or refugees. The leaflet says that people should be angry about these 'illegal entrants':

Every time illegal entrants arrive on our shores people become angry. They are angry because:

- they read media reports that say people smugglers are working with some individuals in Australia
- millions of taxpayers' money is spent on locating, detaining and removing illegal entrants when it could be spent on other services for the Australian community
- they do not like people who try to jump the queue ahead of people who are trying to come to Australia legally (DIMA 1999b).

Here, it is not simply implied how people – to include the reader – *should* feel as much as it explicitly tells them that they *are* 'angry' about the people coming by boat. In this way, the Government is using the OIC to convey negative images of 'boat people' and thus, create specific

Hightower

emotional responses from the reader concerning their presence (or attempted presence) in the country. The leaflet concludes by suggesting that: 'We all have a responsibility to stop people becoming victims of people smugglers' (DIMA 1999b) and directs readers to additional information that can be found on another leaflet entitled: '**WHAT YOU CAN DO TO HELP STOP ILLEGAL MIGRATION**' (DIMA 1999b). On this particular leaflet Australians are encouraged to actively tell people who are thinking about coming to Australia by boat that 'they will fail, they will be ruined financially and they could die' (DIMA 1999b).

The *Pay a People Smuggler and You'll Pay the Price* campaign limits all reference to refugees as 'illegal entrants' and only mentions the dangers of coming to Australia by boat. This attempts to convince the reader that they are performing a service not only to the country, but also to the potential entrant who is putting their life in danger. Notions of humanitarianism, legal obligation or asylum are never introduced. Also not mentioned are the terrible conditions which people face in their home or transit countries that cause them to flee to Australia in the first place. Instead, the sheet says 'The Government is confident that all sections of the Australian community do not agree with illegal migration' (DIMA 1999b). Again, this is another example of the public being told what to feel about illegal immigration, people smuggling and consequently, asylum seekers.

On a leaflet entitled '**HOW AUSTRALIA IS STOPPING ILLEGALS**' (DIMA 1999b), the Australian Government states that it is 'getting tougher with illegal entrants' and has 'introduced a range of initiatives' to stop illegal entrants from arriving on Australian shores (DIMA 1999b). These 'initiatives' include the introduction of a 20-year jail sentence and fines up to \$220,000 for people smugglers as well as 'excluding unauthorised arrivals from accessing permanent residence by giving genuine refugees a three-year temporary protection visa or a short-term safe haven visa' (DIMA 1999b). Continuing with the theme of deterrence and punishment, a leaflet entitled: '**PAY A PEOPLE SMUGGLER AND YOU'LL PAY THE PRICE**' (DIMA 1999b)

warns that ‘boat people are placed in detention at Port Hedland or Curtin [which is] 1,500 km from the nearest capital city, Perth, and Curtin is 2,200km from Perth’ (DIMA 1999b). People are warned that many ‘boat people’ have been ‘returned home’ while the rest are ‘not released into the Australian community’, are ‘not allowed to work’ and have ‘lost all the money they paid to people smugglers’ (DIMA 1999b). People are also told that ‘boat people’ will pay and lose large sums of money to people smugglers and that ‘sometimes they die’ when attempting to come to Australia (DIMA 1999b).

As these above example evince, this pamphlet is based on an emotive narrative. Firstly, for refugees, it is a warning that coming to Australia is dangerous; it sends a clear message that they will not be welcome and may lose their money or even their lives if they use a people smuggler to come to Australia. Secondly, for the ‘average’ citizen of Australia, the campaign tells them that ‘illegal entrants’ are a ‘threat’ to the country; it also explains how the government is combating the ‘threat’ of illegal entrants and people smugglers and what they can do to help. Further, the pamphlet not only tells people that they feel angry about illegal entrant, but it encourages them to feel this way. The narrative elevates the notion that people who use people smugglers are ‘illegal entrants’ while never mentioning the fact that they may be asylum seekers with a legal right to seek protection. In addition, the pamphlet suggests how Australians not only ‘can’ help stop people smuggling activities, but appeals to each person’s civic duty; that they ‘must’ not help illegal entrants.

The cover of another pamphlet and a large poster in the information pack says: ‘Thinking of going to Australia? **STOP**. Do not travel to Australia without a visa or proper travel documents’ (DIMA 1999b). The image shows a locked gate with a sign which reads: ‘Keep Gate Closed’. The pamphlet warns the reader:

- If you choose to enter Australia illegally, without a visa ...
- You will **NOT** be welcome
 - You **WILL** be caught
 - You **WILL** be kept in detention centres, thousands of kilometres from Sydney

Hightower

- You could **LOSE** all your money and be sent back
IT'S NOT WORTH THE RISK!

To Travel to Australia you must have a visa from an Australian Government Office (DIMA 1999b).



Figure 1: 'Pay a People Smuggler and You'll Pay the Price',
'ITS NOT WORTH THE RISK' poster.

The *Pay a People Smuggler* OIC also included a poster campaign. One such poster reads: 'Pay a People Smuggler and You'll Pay the Price. Its [sic] Not Worth The Risk' (DIMA 1999). The poster (see Figure 1) shows an image of Australia with the outlines of human figures strewn across the poster. Each figure has a number next to it signifying the numbers of 'boat people' who have allegedly been 'caught'. Interestingly, the poster bears a striking resemblance the Aboriginal Flag; a flag originally used for the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Island land rights movement until the Government granted it Flag of Australia status in 1995. Using the familiar layout and colours black, red and yellow; the middle of the poster reads: '5742 Illegal Boat People Caught in the Last Ten Years' (DIMA 1999b). This image has, of course, been unfairly misappropriated.

The slogan used on the campaign's 'China-Specific Poster' (see Figure 2) reads: *toudu yici huihen zhongsheng*. This translates as the following: *toudu* – To depart and arrive illegally by boat; *yici* – once; one time, *hui hen* – to regret one's actions; *zhong sheng* – for the rest of your life (DIMA 1999b).¹² The poster has four cartoon illustrations. Each cartoon has a single Chinese character in the corner of the image and two characters underneath that provide a clearer description of the concepts expressed by the single character. In the first image (reading right to left) shows man relaxing on a bale of hay next to farming fields and daydreaming about the city. It is a beautiful day, yet despite this, he desires to be elsewhere; the 'thought bubble' above his head with an image of the city as well as his smiling face indicate this. In the background of this image there is a dark silhouette of a woman and child with their arm around each other; the caption reads: 'to dream' (DIMA 1999b).

The second illustration shows the man paying a people smuggler. The smuggler (who looks like a snake) is standing in a small boat. The snake image evokes the term 'snake head', the Indonesian police's nickname for people smugglers. Inside the boat the silhouettes of other passengers can be faintly seen. The caption reads: 'to commit a crime' (DIMA 1999b). The third image shows the man being surprised and/or scared by a kangaroo who meets him on the shore. The man is alone and there is a dark silhouette of a vessel like a pirate-ship sailing away in the distance. There is also a quite large and pronounced image of an airplane above the man. These images – the dark, silhouetted image of the boat and the pronounced image of the aircraft – are used to signify the difference between what the Government considers 'legal' and 'illegal' methods of entry. The kangaroo, wearing a hat and looking quite official, confronts the man with a slip of paper and handcuffs in its hand. The caption here reads: 'to return home' (DIMA 1999b). In the final illustration, the man has been returned home and to his field. However, instead of returning to a carefree existence as indicated in the first image, this time the skies are grey and the man is shown in the background; he is working in the field with sweat dripping down his face. This time, the woman and child have been moved to the

foreground and both are in tears. In the bottom corner of the illustration the 'snake head' greedily counts his money. The caption reads: 'to be extremely poor and needy' (DIMA 1999b).



Figure 2: 'Pay a People Smuggler and You'll Pay the Price', China Specific Poster.

It has been shown that the entire *Pay a People Smuggler and You'll Pay the Price* campaign seeks to retract – or at least reduce the quality of – the offer of Australian hospitality. Through this theatricalised encounter, Australia becomes a dangerous and unwelcoming place. The campaign also sends a message domestically: that ‘initiatives’ are being taken to stop people smugglers and ‘boat people’ who arrive ‘illegally’ into the country. These messages attempt to create feelings of fear and anger among Australian citizenry. The OIC appeals to each person’s civic duty by encouraging them to actively participate in deterring ‘illegals’ (read asylum seekers) from entering the country. Internationally, the campaign sends another fearful message: a warning which aims to strike fear into minds of potential asylum seekers. The border is presented as a space which is remote, dangerous, inhospitable and to be avoided. It warns people that they are not welcome and that they are committing a crime by coming to Australia by boat. Refugees are discouraged by stories of dangerous journeys and threats of being unwelcome once they arrive. As part of this threat, they are told that they will be placed not only in detention centres, but in remote desert detention centres far away from capital cities. The campaign also uses images of crocodiles, sharks, snakes, and isolated detention centres in deserts to convince people that ‘it’s not worth’ coming to Australia. The *Pay a People Smuggler and You'll Pay the Price* campaign suggests that there is a ‘price’ to be paid if a person attempts to come to Australia by boat. In short, the price paid equates to encountering an unwelcoming country.

B Sri Lankan ‘Street Drama’¹³

In 2007 Kevin Rudd’s Labor Party defeated prime minister John Howard, whose Coalition Party had been in power since 1996. Once again refugees and ‘boat people’ were an election topic and placed at the top of the national agenda. Arrivals from Sri Lanka and Afghanistan were of particular concern to the Rudd Government. On April 9, 2010 the ministers for Immigration, Foreign Affairs and Home Affairs announced that there would be a refugee processing ‘freeze’ of new

Hightower

asylum claims from Sri Lankan or Afghan nationals. This ‘freeze’ was limited only to Sri Lankan and Afghan claims for asylum and was heavily criticised for being in breach of the non-discrimination provision found in the Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees 1951 (Art 3) and other human rights treaties (McAdam and Murphy 2010). However, despite this criticism, during its time, the processing freeze used ‘information material’ in order to ‘warn’ Sri Lankans and Afghani people against coming to Australia. As part of the 2009–2010 Federal Budget to ‘combat’ people smuggling and increase border security, \$4 million was used to fund a ‘counter people smuggling information campaign’ (Attorney-General’s Department 2009).¹⁴ Part of this campaign was to finance Saatchi & Saatchi – one of the world’s largest advertising agencies – to put on ‘street performances’ in Sri Lanka in order to deter people smugglers.¹⁵ According to Saatchi and Saatchi’s website, one of their many areas of ‘expertise’ is ‘refugee awareness’ (2013).¹⁶ However, as *The Daily Telegraph* suggested, the ‘street drama’ was less about refugee awareness and more concerned with conducting a ‘secret war against illegal immigration’ (Lewis and Packham 2009a). Similarly, *The Courier Mail* called it a ‘weapon in [the] fight to deter illegal entrants’ (Lewis and Packham 2009b). Ronald Peiris, the creator of the campaign, stated

A lot of rumours are being spread that people can make it. ... What we want to tell the people is that what you hear is not what really happens. ... The idea is to say that irregular migration will get you nowhere (Lewis and Packham 2009b).¹⁷

The Australian Government said that the campaign also targeted Catholic churches and issued them “‘a variety of printed material’ and seminars’ to spread its message (Lewis and Packham 2009b). This message, according to the Government, was to ‘inform potential irregular migrants of the realities, risks and consequences of irregular migration, in particular the dangers associated with long sea voyages’ (Lewis and Packham 2009b). *The Daily Telegraph* reported that ‘Posters and street banners will also be strung warning people against taking to the high seas in illegal efforts to reach Australia’ (Lewis and Packham

2009a). In addition, ‘livelihood packages’ including four hundred chairs, three hundred fishing nets and fifty volleyballs – all printed with warnings about coming to Australia by boat – were handed out as part of the advertising campaign. Small business loans were also distributed to encourage people to stay in their home country (Hodge 2009). As far as the actual ‘street drama’, there is little information readily available about the specific details, such as how many performances there were, how many people participated in the campaign or how the ‘drama’ was in fact, scripted. However, it is known that local actors were used to play the roles of people smugglers in order to warn local people that their ‘efforts to escape from Sri Lanka will end in disappointment’ (Hodge 2009).

Like the information material used in the *Pay a People Smuggler and You’ll Pay the Price* campaign, the ‘street drama’ OIC created by Saatchi and Saatchi sought to make a particular point about the Australian border to refugee source countries. In so doing, the border (or the message projected out from the border) comes into a stylised ‘contact’ with potential asylum seekers and refugees. Local people were paid to ‘act out’ particularly grim possibilities people may face if they attempt to come to Australia by boat. At this moment both the potential asylum seeker and border ‘appear’– the stylised border appears to asylum seekers through the performances of the actors and the asylum seekers start to appear as a particular type as a result of these performances. Through the performance of the actors, the border is portrayed as dangerous and subsequently, ‘appears’ as something that should be feared. Conversely, the viewer (ideally, the potential asylum seeker) is also forced into ‘appearing’ as a certain type: fearful and uncertain of the border crossing. Money and other gifts were also given to people within the community to deter people from making the journey. Although messages were printed on the gifts warning people not to come by boat, the Government hoped to send another message; despite the lack of welcome, Australia is still a compassionate and generous country. The ‘street drama’ OIC was used to compel certain types of appearances at the border. Or put another way, to discourage

Hightower

appearances at the border through the use of dramatic performances.

C Social Media Campaign – ‘No To People Smuggling’

In 2010 the Labor Party replaced Kevin Rudd as their leader, making Julia Gillard Prime Minister of Australia. This act was prompted by fears that Rudd would lose the upcoming Federal election. As in previous election years, ‘boat people’ emerged as a ‘hot topic’ in the campaign. Part of the Gillard Government’s ‘initiative’ to stop people from attempting to enter Australia by boat was moved into the area of social media. Since 2010, the Government has placed several videos on its *No to people smuggling* channel on YouTube. The videos are said to be ‘dramatisations’ that depict graphic and sensationalist scenes such as uncaring people smugglers, harsh detention centre conditions, arrests and a seemingly endless video depicting a person drowning at sea. The videos are available in several different languages: Arabic, Dari, Farsi, Pashto, Sinhalese, Tamil and English. In what follows, I will analyse a selection of the videos which can currently be found on the this YouTube channel.

The Smuggler (2010) is a video portraying a ‘sting’ operation involving Australian police attempting to catch people in Australia who are sending money overseas to their friends or family in an attempt to fund their transport to Australia. As the description for the video reads:

The Smuggler focuses on the risks associated with funding families, friends and loved ones’ unlawful sea voyages under new Australian Government laws which provide for stiff fines for those offering financial and/or material support to people smugglers. The drama unfolds from withdrawing the cash through to police arrest (2010).

At the beginning of the video the viewer is informed that what is about to be shown is a ‘dramatisation’ involving ‘actors and staff from the Department of Immigration and Citizenship (DIAC), and/or partner agencies’ and that it was ‘Filmed under supervised controlled conditions’. The video depicts a family – a husband and wife with a small child – who are placed under surveillance while they procure money to give to an unnamed man who has offered to help their family

members come to Australia. The man is also placed under surveillance by police and ultimately arrested and charged with people smuggling offences. After this point in the video, the police turn their attention to the family. The police raid the family's home, explaining 'We believe you have been financing people smugglers'. One of the characters, clearly distressed and holding a crying baby then exclaims 'I'm helping my family'. The husband is handcuffed, arrested and taken out of his home. The video closes with one of the police officers asserting that 'There are other lawful means to come to Australia'. This video sends the message that the Australian Government will not welcome or show any level of hospitality to people who come to Australia by boat. In addition, people already in the country who attempt to help people come to the country by this means also run the risk of being associated with people smuggling activities.

The YouTube description of the video *Safety Gear* (2012) reads: 'People smuggling is not as straightforward as it is sold to gullible people. Don't risk it'. In this video, two men walk down a beach alone. Text briefly appears on the screen informing the viewer that the men are preparing for some 'easy money'. One man states 'There's a storm coming in'. The other replies 'Anyway, it's not our problem'. The first man agrees. They proceed to do an inventory of all the items on a small boat: oars, fresh water, spare petrol, first aid kit and lifejackets. However, instead of loading the items on the boat, every item on the list is taken off the boat, except for life jackets. The first man tells the other: 'Oh. Did you remember the lifejackets?' The second man says: 'No. I nearly forgot.' and then proceeds to remove them from the boat as well. The first man then says: 'Save two for us though' and the other 'smuggler' picks up two lifejackets, hands one to his companion and then they both put their own lifejackets on the boat. As the video ends, the men prepare to 'shove off'. Text then appears of the screen: 'The risk of drowning, losing family, or losing your money and being cheated by a people smuggler, is real'. The *Safety Gear* video suggests that smugglers do not care about the safety of their passengers and deliberately put people's lives in danger. As such, the video seeks to inform the viewer that attempting to reach Australia through the use

Hightower

of a smuggler could see them lose their lives or become financially ruined. *Left Behind* (2010) is described on YouTube as a 'powerful 30 second message that highlights the dangers and unpredictability of the sea voyage to Australia at the hands of people smugglers'. People smugglers are described as 'merciless' people who have 'little regard for human life'. Simply put, *Left Behind* is a painfully realistic video of a man drowning in rough waters. The video puts the viewer into the position of the drowning victim; viewers see what he sees, hear what he hears and feels what he feels. Repeatedly, the man goes under water and then briefly comes above water only to gasp for air. Text appears and disappears throughout the *Left Behind* video, prolonging the duration of the 'dramatisation'. Such text reads:

No one knows where you are ... No one can hear you ... No one should go through this ... No one can trust a people smuggler (2010).

The sky is dark and cloudy. Every time the man's head goes under water the image on the screen is made that much darker until finally, the screen goes black. It is at this point that text appears: 'No to people smuggling'. Through the use of horrific dramatization, this video warns that if a person comes to Australia by boat they will drown. It also says that people smugglers are to blame for this danger. In addition, the video warns that there will be no assistance as the authorities do not know where you are and cannot hear your pleas for help. By this suggestion, the Australian Government distances itself from refugees who may find themselves on the high seas and in need of aid.

The video *Don't Ignore the Signs* (2012) says: 'There are a number of ways to make the journey to Australia. Making the dangerous sea voyage with a people smuggler is the wrong way'. As in previous videos, people are once again warned that people smugglers 'operate small and often unseaworthy vessels with little regard for human life'. Like the other videos, the video starts with images of a stormy ocean with dark clouds overhead. As the title of the video suggests, people should not ignore the 'signs' when attempting to come to Australia. The first *sign* that the viewer sees is on the ocean's shore is the recognisable red, octagon-shaped stop sign that is used on the roads of many countries.

The stop sign can be read from some shore *over there* from which people embark on their journey to Australia. Slowly, two more signs come into focus in the distance one after the other: one after the other: 'Danger' and 'Wrong Way Go Back'. The signs are out in the middle of the stormy sea with dark clouds overhead. This sends the message that any journey made by boat to Australia shores are 'dangerous' and in fact, the 'wrong way'. Text appears on the screen at the end of the video reminding the viewer: 'Don't ignore the signs' This video aims to drive the point home that people will be unwelcome if they come to Australia by boat. It says clearly that this is the 'wrong way' and that people should 'go back'. The video shows Australia's lack of hospitality to particular types of refugees.

While videos like these attack people smugglers, others, like the more recent *No Advantage* videos, are directed at those who would attempt such a journey. The transcript of the video *Australia by boat - No Advantage!* (2012) reads:

There is no advantage in paying a people smuggler to travel to Australia. The Australian Government is preparing to transfer asylum seekers who travel by boat to Nauru or Manus Island, Papua New Guinea. This includes people who arrive alone, in family groups and children. You don't get an advantage because you've got on a boat.

No advantage... boat arrivals will not make it to Australia.

No advantage... boat arrivals will not be processed faster than people waiting in refugee camps.

No advantage... boat arrivals will not be able to sponsor family to come to Australia through the humanitarian program.

Australia by boat? — there is no advantage.

This video seeks to inform potential asylum seekers that Australia has changed its policy towards boat arrival. It suggests that that they will no longer be welcome or be given an 'advantage'. Instead, they will be penalised; sent to Nauru or Manus Island. To further accentuate the unwelcoming attitude, the video says that this deportation will include

Hightower

men, women and children. As an added deterrence, people are told that they will not be able to bring their family to Australia in the future.

You won't be settled (2013) sends a similar message to refugees. In a very firm voice and deliberate pace, the narrator of the video says:

If you haven't already heard, the rules have changed. If you arrive by boat, without a visa, you will be sent to another country. The people smugglers cannot sell you a ticket to Australia anymore. You will be settled in Papua New Guinea or Nauru. You won't be settled in Australia.

Throughout the video images are shown of how people are treated once they come into Australian custody. They are put on a plane and sent to another country where they are placed in detention centres. The video aims to demonstrate that Australia will not be hospitable to people who arrive by boat. In fact, the Government sends a very unwelcoming message: that there is no chance that people who come by boat will ever be allowed in Australia.

Each of the examples above demonstrate that the Australian Government stages certain encounters at the border. Domestically, the Government uses 'information campaigns' which include social media to spread several different 'messages' about people who come by boat to Australia. Firstly, it is suggested that people who arrive by boat are 'illegal entrants' and consequently, it is a legal condition that they must be held in mandatory detention for long periods of time. This suggestion contradicts Article 31 of the Refugee Convention, which clearly states that Contracting States shall not impose penalties on refugee's illegal entry or presence in a country (*Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees 1951*). The OICs also suggest that people smugglers take advantage of 'gullible' people and deliberately put them in danger; particularly by crossing rough waters on unseaworthy vessels. While these messages are made clear, other messages are not – like the fact that some convicted people smugglers are refugees themselves who tried to get their families to safety. The message that asylum seekers and refugees have a legal right to enter Australia is also neglected. In addition, people smugglers are presented as uncaring and opportunistic

criminals. However, there is no mention of the ‘people smugglers’ who have challenges pending before the High Court, claiming that they are not criminals and merely aiding refugees who are seeking protection.¹⁸

The social media OICs thus send ‘strong messages’, specifically, that coming to Australia by boat in order to claim asylum is ‘illegal’ and that people smugglers are taking advantage of asylum seekers and only want their money. These OICs also suggest that these journeys are so dangerous that they could die. The Government warns that if the journey does not kill them then men women and children will end up in detention centres in remote and dangerous areas for as long as they would in camps overseas. It is suggested that all the ‘information’ in the campaign are the ‘facts’ about coming to Australia. However, what it amounts to is a theatricalized, fact-creating encounter.

The OICs attempt to shape public opinion regarding those people who come by boat, specifically, that they are a threat and should be stopped. At the same time, they paint a bleak picture of the conditions faced by refugees in Australia in order to deter other people from coming by boat. Despite these ‘scare tactics’, people will continue to come to Australia by boat. This is due to the ‘facts’ which the OICs do not mention – namely, the *fact* that conditions and situations that asylum seekers and refugees face overseas compel them to leave in order to find protection and the *fact* that they have a lawful right to seek this protection in Australia.

3 Recent Developments and Conclusion

Australian Overseas Information Campaigns cannot be considered merely a method employed by Government to inform others of its migration system policies – at least, not to the extent that it simply offers factual information about seeking asylum. These campaigns create specific migration outcomes such as deterring and discouraging uninvited people from coming to Australian shores. Perhaps the ultimate outcome that the Government would like to achieve is the *will* mentioned at the beginning of this article – that Australia *will* determine who arrives at and enters through its borders; this *will*

Hightower

includes people who come to the country by boat in order to seek asylum.

It is unfortunate however, that the Government does not seem to consider the negative implications of unwaveringly keeping people out and conducting campaigns to ensure that they stay out. As mentioned earlier, there is no doubt that the OICs discussed in this article are scare tactics that are used without consideration of the 'real life' situations vulnerable people face around the world. Australia has recently come under scrutiny for running such campaigns in countries where the need for protection is clearly evident. For instance, on September 3, 2011 a bomb attack at a Shia Muslim rally in Quetta killed 42 and injured 80 people. It was found that the blast specifically targeted Hazara people who were attending the rally. Since Hazaras face persecution in their home country of Afghanistan, many flee to Pakistan; however, once there they encounter further persecution and violence. The terrible reality of this event is only compounded by the fact that this place in Quetta was also the site of an Australian OIC. A large billboard of a 'leaky boat' forms the backdrop of the destruction (see Figures 3 and 4). The poster warns people not to come to Australia the 'illegal way' (Hammond 2011; Editorial 2011). The placement of such a billboard in Quetta clearly demonstrates how the Australian Government ignores the needs of vulnerable people such as the Hazaras. Jack Smit (2011), a spokesperson from Project SafeCom observed the following:

Australia's callousness is made larger when you realise that you won't get anywhere with the Australian Embassy in Pakistan or Afghanistan, that the United Nations Refugee Agency UNHCR is under resourced, overworked and often inadequate, if not inappropriate. ... at Australian Embassies, immigration applications made by refugees are simply and callously rejected. Australia refuses to respond humanely and flexibly to 'uninvited asylum seekers', forcing such asylum claimants to seek informal and alternative travel. In effect, Australia supports and grows the people smuggling industry, and then punishes those who use people smugglers with indefinite mandatory detention, depicting them as the 'how-dare-they-come-here' asylum seekers.



Figure 3: Overseas Information Campaign in Quetta on September 3, 2011. (Poster circled in background.) Image taken from Project Safecom (2011)



Figure 4: Overseas Information Campaign in Quetta on September 3, 2011. Image taken from Hazara News Pakistan.

Hightower

In this article, I have shown that with each successive Australian Government a new OIC has been introduced in order to deter people from Australia borders. The Government's latest series of campaigns contain perhaps its most foreboding message yet. In an interesting turn of events, in June 2013, the Australian Labour Party, fearful of losing the upcoming election, replaced prime minister Julia Gillard with former leader, Kevin Rudd. Almost immediately after this change, the new government announced that it would be sending an even stronger message to refugees who attempt to come to Australia by boat. On 19 July, Kevin Rudd announced that 'From now on, any asylum seeker who arrives in Australia by boat will have no chance of being settled in Australia as a refugee' (Crowe and Callick 2013). This statement highlights the beginning of Australia's newest OIC: *By Boat, No Visa*. Once again, refugees were warned that the means in which they seek protection presents certain risks. The DIAC website (2013) was recently updated with the following message:

Don't risk your family's safety. Don't waste your money.

Don't risk your life or waste your time or money by paying people smugglers. If you pay a people smuggler you are buying a ticket to another country.

Australia by boat means:

- being sent straight to Papua New Guinea or Nauru for processing
- being settled in Papua New Guinea or Nauru, but not Australia, even if you are found to be a refugee
- not being reunited with family and friends in Australia

Like the other OICs mentioned in this chapter, the *By Boat, No Visa* campaign uses images to convey emotions of fear, scepticism and an inhospitable border (see Figure 5); this time the message is much blunter; less hospitable: 'YOU WON'T BE SETTLED IN AUSTRALIA'.

Australian Government

This is the Australian Government's message for anyone associated with people smuggling:

IF YOU COME HERE BY BOAT WITHOUT A VISA

YOU WON'T BE SETTLED IN AUSTRALIA

www.australia.gov.au/novisa



THERE'S NO POINT GETTING ON A BOAT ANYMORE

هذه هي رسالة الحكومة الأسترالية لأي شخص يرتبط مع تهريب البشر: إذا قدمت إلى هنا على متن قارب بدون تأشيرة فإن يتم توظيفه في أستراليا.

این پیام دولت استرالیا است برای هر کس که در قایق آسانی دست دارد. اگر شما توسط کشتی بدون ویزا اینجا بیاید شما در استرالیا متوطن شده نمیوانید.

این پیام دولت استرالیا به افرادی است که با قایقهای آسان در ارتباط هستند: اگر با قایق و بدون ویزا اینجا بیایید، شما در استرالیا اسکان داده نخواهید شد.

دا د استرالیا دولت خرابیا هر چه که دد چی په انسانی قاچاق لاس لری: که تاسو بهر د ویزی د کشتی پواسطه بلته رالسي تاسو په په استرالیا کی مېشته نه شي.

මෙහි දර්ශනම පමණක් මෙහෙයවනු ලබන පමණික පෙට්ටි මෙහි වෙසීමෙන් තැන්පත් කිරීමට පටන් නොගත් වෙ.

இது மக்களாகக் கருவாதல் கட்டுப்பாட்டில் உள்ளவர்களை ஒன்றிடுவதில் அரசாங்கத்தின் கோரிடம்: தீவிரம் மீறா இவற்றி வசமில் ஒவ்வொரு இடம், மற்றவர்க தீவிரம் ஒன்றிடுவதில் கருவாதத்தின் உள் உள்ளம்.

Đây là thông điệp của Chính Phủ Úc cho bất cứ ai liên hệ đến nạn buôn người.
Nếu qui vị đến đây bằng thuyền không có visa qui vị sẽ không được định cư ở Úc.

Authorised by the Australian Government, Capital Hill, Canberra.

Figure 5: One of the many posters distributed by DIAC as part of the By Boat, No Visa ad campaign. Image taken from DIAC website.

On 7 September 2013, Tony Abbott replaced Kevin Rudd as Prime Minister of Australia. DIAC is currently in the process of restructuring many of its policies and strategies that deal with the

Hightower

‘threat’ of people smuggling. The direction of these changes is illustrated by the Department’s upcoming change in name from the Department of Immigration and Citizenship to the Department of Immigration and Border Security. The portion of the Department website that deals with ‘Irregular Maritime Arrivals’ is unavailable while it is being updated – for some, an uneasy reminder of the all the possible restrictive policies yet to come.

People who come into contact with and who are influenced by OICs are left with uncertain feelings about exercising their legal right to seek protection in Australia. Such campaigns that seek to spread ‘information’ concerning the border misrepresent the reality that people do have the right to seek asylum in Australia regardless of their means of entry. This article has shown that the Australian Government uses OICs to retract any perception that arrivals by boat are welcome – effectively working against cosmopolitan and unconditional hospitality principles. The goal for asylum seekers, legal professionals, and refugee advocates is to not be discouraged by the border theatrics of the Australian Government. As it has done for so long, Australia justifies its actions through a promotion of fear both at home and abroad. The Government ‘stages’ these types of identities and encounters. It ensures that the border ‘appear’ as something either invisible, scary or dangerous to potential asylum seekers and refugees who are a group of people – more than any other in world – who need to have their presence seen and heard.

Notes

1. There are actually two versions of this handbook made available to future migrants: an adult edition and a youth edition.
2. The Australian Government has been focused on sending a ‘clear’ or ‘strong’ message to ‘those associated with people smugglers’ (read: boat people) since the Howard Administration (For instance see DIAC 1999a). This message has been echoed by each successive Government (For instance see Veiszadeh 2013).

3. Much of DIAC's information, to include the OICs material, use bold or large font to emphasize the point being made. Throughout this article, unless noted otherwise, all emphasis is the Australian Government's original emphasis. This particular message was previously located on the DIAC website, but has since been updated. See conclusion of this chapter.
4. Specifically, Article 31:1 of the Refugee Convention states that people shall not be penalised for illegal entry or presence in a Contracting State.
5. To illustrate this point, in 2011 the Government amended the *Migration Act 1958* by inserting the *Deterring People Smuggling Act 2011*. The explanatory memorandum states that the 'amendments relate to the serious crimes of people smuggling and aggravated people smuggling, and do not affect the rights of individuals seeking protection or asylum in Australia' (*Deterring People Smuggling Act 2011: Explanatory Memorandum*). However, in fact, the amendment does quite the opposite. For instance, people who arrive by boat and do not have a visa have 'no lawful right to come to Australia ...whether or not Australia has, or may have, protection obligations in respect of the non-citizen: (a) under the Refugees Convention as amended by the Refugees Protocol; or (b) for any other reason' (228B:1 and 228B:2).
6. There is of course no refugee 'queue'. The notion has been condemned by the UNHCR and rejected by the courts (see *R v Al Hassan Abdolamir Al Jenabi* (2004)). Despite this, the idea of a queue is still promoted by the Government and often mentioned in the media.
7. For instance, as a response to the 'threat' of 'illegal' boat arrivals, the Government excised small islands off the Australian coast for the purposes of migration. In other words, claims for asylum could no longer be made in those excised areas. Eventually, the entire mainland of Australia was excised for boat arrivals.
8. Deterrence from the border has historically been based on race and fear of others. While the White Australia policy was officially adopted in 1901 and later, progressively dismantled between 1949 and 1973, a strong argument can be made that it still exists in some form or another in Australian immigration policy. For instance see *The long, slow death of white Australia* (Tavan 2005), *Creating White Australia* (Carey and McLisky 2009) and *From White Australia to Woomera: The Story of Australian Immigration* (Jupp 2002).

Hightower

9. SIEV-X—or Suspected Illegal Entry Vessel X—was an Indonesian fishing boat that was en route from Sumatra to Christmas Island carrying over 400 asylum seekers. It sank in international waters on 19 October 2001, killing approximately 146 children, 142 women and 65 men. For more on this tragedy see *A certain maritime incident: the sinking of SIEV X* (Kevin 2004).
10. Information regarding this campaign was previously located on the DIMA website, but has since been removed.
11. Note the use of the words ‘high risk’ in relation to people smuggling as opposed to ‘high need’ in relation to people seeking asylum.
12. All translations are DIMA’s translations unless otherwise noted.
13. Although I could not find an official title for this Government program, this ‘initiative’ is officially referred to by the Government as an ‘Overseas Information Campaign’. However, unofficially, it has also been dubbed by the media as the ‘Stay the Bloody Hell Away’ campaign. This reference is made to Tourism Australia’s ‘Where the Bloody Hell Are You’ campaign. See ‘Ad gurus hired to deter refugees’ (9News 2009).
14. In fact, this represents a small portion of the \$654 million which was allocated to fund a ‘comprehensive, whole-of-government strategy to combat people smuggling and enhance border protection’. See *New Measures to Enhance Australia’s Border Protection* (Attorney-General’s Department 2009). See also *Budget measures: budget paper no. 2: 2009–10* (Parliament of Australia 2009).
15. More precisely, the Australian Government stated that they paid the International Organisation for Migration (IOM) to create a ‘counter-people smuggling communications campaign’. The IOM then sub-contracted Saatchi and Saatchi to ‘deliver some aspects of the project’. See *Questions in Writing: Saatchi and Saatchi Illegal Arrivals Campaign* (Parliament of Australia 2010).
16. Saatchi and Saatchi also claim to have advertising expertise that range from ice-cream, sunglasses and watches to the elimination of nuclear testing and racism. See *Saatchi and Saatchi Factsheet* (2013).
17. Here, it might be noted, the shift from ‘illegal’ migration to ‘irregular’ migration. This change is also marked in DIAC’s website and press releases. However, as one might assume, there is nothing that might be considered ‘regular’ about seeking asylum.

18. For instance, see 'People Smugglers' case could go to High Court' (Waters 2011) See also 'Lawyer throws down challenge in people smuggling case' (Jacobsen 2011).

References

- 9News 2009 'Ad gurus hired to deter refugees' 6 October Available from <http://news.ninemsn.com.au/world/871952/ad-gurus-hired-to-deter-refugees> Last accessed 20 June 2013.
- Attorney-General's Department 2009 *New Measures to Enhance Australia's Border Protection*. Media Release. 12 May 2009. Available from <http://www.ag.gov.au/Publications/Budgets/Budget2009-10/Pages/NewMeasuresToEnhanceAustraliasBorderProtection.aspx> Last accessed 21 November 2013.
- Carey J & McLisky C Eds 2009 *Creating white Australia* Sydney University Press Sydney
- Conquergood D 2002 'Performance Studies: Interventions and Radical Research' *TDR* 46/2:145-156
- Crock M, Saul B and Dastyari, A 2007 *Future Seekers II: Refugees and Irregular Migration in Australia*. Federation Press Sydney (2nd edition).
- Crowe D and Callick R 2013 'Kevin Rudd unveils 'hard-line' PNG solution for asylum seekers' *The Australian* 19 July Available from <http://www.theaustralian.com.au/national-affairs/policy/kevin-rudd-to-unveil-manus-island-expansion-plan-in-bid-to-stop-boats/story-fn9hm1gu-1226681830019> Last accessed 21 November 2013.
- Derrida J 2001 *On cosmopolitanism and forgiveness* Routledge New York
- 2000 *Of hospitality / Anne Dufourmantelle invites Jacques Derrida to respond* Trans Bowlby R Stanford University Press Stanford
- 1999 *Adieu: to Emmanuel Levinas* Trans Brault P and Nass M Stanford University Press Stanford
- DIAC 2013 *Visas, Immigration and Refugees: By Boat, No Visa* Available from <http://www.immi.gov.au/visas/humanitarian/novisa/> Last accessed 20 June 2013.
- 2012 *AUSCO Resources*. Available from <http://www.immi.gov.au/visas/humanitarian/offshore/ausco-resources.htm> Last accessed 21 November 2013.

Hightower

- 2012b *Video Transcript of Australia by boat – no advantage*. Available from <http://www.immi.gov.au/managing-australias-borders/border-security/irregular-entry/no-people-smuggling/transcript-australia-by-boat-no-advantage.htm> Last accessed 21 November 2013.
- 2012c *Visas, Immigration and Refugees: Don't be sorry*. Available from <http://www.immi.gov.au/visas/humanitarian/dontbesorry/> Last accessed 21 November 2013.
- 2011 *Australian Cultural Orientation (AUSCO) Handbook: Adult 2011 Edition*. Available from http://www.immi.gov.au/visas/humanitarian/_pdf/ausco_adult_handbook.pdf Last accessed 21 November 2013.
- DIMA 1999 *New Campaign To Stop Illegal Entrants*. Media Release. MPS 155/99 29 October
- 1999b *Pay a People Smuggler and You'll Pay the Price: Its Not Worth the Risk*. (Information Pack DIAC) Canberra. 15 pages.
- 2000 *The Perils of People Smuggling Revealed*. Media Release. MPS 063/2000 15 June
- Hazara News Pakistan 2011 '73 Killed in Suicide Attack in Quetta' 6 September Available from <http://hazaranewspakistan.wordpress.com/2010/09/06/73-killed-in-suicide-attack-in-quetta/#>. Last accessed 21 November 2013.
- Hall E 2000 'Sharks, Crocodiles and Snakes to Scare Off Illegal Immigrants' *The World Today* 15 June Available from <http://www.abc.net.au/worldtoday/stories/s140600.htm> Last accessed 21 November 2013.
- Hammond J 2011 'Refugee leaky boat billboard anger' *The West Australian* (online) 25 October Available from <http://au.news.yahoo.com/thewest/a/-/breaking/10869608/refugee-leaky-boat-billboard-anger/> Last accessed 21 November 2013.
- Hodge A 2009 'Volleyball nets spearhead anti-boatpeople campaign' *The Australian* 12 October
- Howard J 2001 *John Howard's 2001 Election Policy Speech* 28 October Available from <http://australianpolitics.com/news/2001/01-10-28.shtml> Last accessed 21 November 2013.

- Jacobsen G 2011 'Lawyer throws down challenge in people smuggling case' *Sydney Morning Herald* 4 October 2011. Available from <http://www.smh.com.au/national/lawyer-throws-down-challenge-in-people-smuggler-case-20111003-115e1.html> Last accessed 21 November 2013.
- Jupp J 2002 *From White Australia to Woomera : The Story of Australian Immigration* Cambridge University Press New York
- Kelleher J and Ridout N Eds *Contemporary Theatres in Europe: A Critical Companion* Routledge New York
- Kevin AC 2004 *A certain maritime incident: the sinking of SIEV X/Tony Kevin* Scribe Publications Melbourne
- Lacan J 1973 *The four fundamental concepts of psych-analysis* Trans Jacques-Alain Miller Hogarth Press London
- Lewis S and Packham B 2009a 'Street theatre to stop influx of illegal immigrants' *The Daily Telegraph* 6 October Available from <http://www.dailytelegraph.com.au/news/street-theatre-to-stop-influx-of-illegal-immigrants/story-e6freuy9-1225783075481> Last accessed 21 November 2013.
- 2009b 'Ad agency weapon in fight to deter illegal entrants' *The Courier Mail* 25 October Available from <http://www.couriermail.com.au/news/ad-agency-weapon-in-fight-to-deter-illegal-entrants/story-e6freon6-1225783081990> Last accessed 21 November 2013.
- McAdam J and Murphy K 2010 'Refugee processing freeze breaches international law' *The Australian* 14 April 2010 Available from <http://www.theaustralian.com.au/news/opinion/refugee-processing-freeze-breaches-international-law/story-e6frg6zo-1225853374644> Last accessed 21 November 2013.
- Nield S 2006 'On the Border as Theatrical Space: appearance, dis-location and the production of the refugee' in Kelleher et al 2006: 61-72.
- notopeoplesmuggling 2010 *No to People Smuggling Channel*. Available from <http://www.youtube.com/user/notopeoplesmuggling/feed> Last accessed 21 November 2013.
- 2012 *Don't Ignore the Signs*. No to people smuggling. 3 April Available from <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=HAccHPBgFR8> Last accessed 21 November 2013.

Hightower

- 2012 *Australia by boat – no Advantage!* No to people smuggling. 2 September Available from <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=5Kt-PEuDnfw> Last accessed 21 November 2013.
 - 2012 *Safety Gear*. No to people smuggling. 9 August Available from <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ja7DOO8YbWM> Last accessed 21 November 2013.
 - 2010 *Left Behind*. 6 June Available from <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=4MP5vsTJvaE&feature=plcp> Last accessed 21 November 2013.
 - 2010 *The Smuggler* 10 September Available from <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=9pU24eEtQuM>. Last accessed 21 November 2013.
 - 2010 *Strengthened anti-people smuggling measures* 17 May Available from <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=DdHpTDZ8P-M&list=PLC273818F3DFE9C64&index=15> Last accessed 21 November 2013.
 - 2013 *You won't be settled* 29 August Available from <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=bvz3U-JOvOU> Last accessed 21 November 2013.
- OECD 2002 *International Migration in Asia: Trends and Policies*. OECD Publishing.
- Online Etymology Dictionary 2013 *Welcome*. Available from <http://www.etymonline.com/index.php?term=welcome> Last Accessed 21 November 2013.
- Parliament of Australia 2010 *Questions in Writing: Saatchi and Saatchi Illegal Arrivals Campaign*. 30 September 2010. Available from <http://parlinfo.aph.gov.au/parlInfo/search/display/display.w3p;db=CHAMBER;id=chamber%2Fhansardr%2F2010-10-25%2F0289;query=Id%3A%22chamber%2Fhansardr%2F2010-10-25%2F0115%22>. Last accessed 21 November 2013.
- 2009 *Budget measures: budget paper no. 2: 2009–10*. Available from <http://www.budget.gov.au/2009-10/content/bp2/html/>. Last accessed 21 November 2013.
- Project Safecom 2011 'Quetta Hazara killings – and an Australian Poster' 23 October 2011 Available from <http://www.safecom.org.au/pdfs/quetta-killings2011-sept3.pdf> Last accessed 21 November 2013.
- Saatchi and Saatchi 2013 *Saatchi and Saatchi Factsheet* 21 February Available from http://www.saatchikevin.com/Saatchi_Saatchi_Factsheet/ Last accessed 21 November 2013.

- Smit J 2011 'Mass Hazara killings at Shia Muslim Rally took place in front of Australian Leaky Boat Billboard' Project SafeCom 24 October Available from <http://www.safecom.org.au/news-2410-2011.htm> Last accessed 21 November 2013.
- Tavan G 2005 *The long, slow death of white Australia* Scribe Publications Melbourne
- United States Committee for Refugees and Immigrants 2001 *U.S. Committee for Refugees World Refugee Survey 2001 – Australia* 20 June Available from <http://www.unhcr.org/refworld/docid/3b31e15d14.html> Last accessed 21 November 2013.
- Veiszadeh E 2013 'Aust will never accept boat people: Rudd' *Australia Associated Press* 19 July Available from <http://www.news.com.au/breaking-news/national/refugees-to-be-resettled-in-third-world/story-e6frfku9-1226681741330> Last accessed 21 November 2013.
- Waters J 2011 'People Smugglers' case could go to High Court' *ABC News* 16 September Available from <http://www.abc.net.au/news/2011-09-16/people-smugglers-court-challenge/2903440> Last accessed 21 November 2013.

Cases

R v AlHassan Abdolamir AlJenabi (2004) 20302840 & 20302843 NTSC

Legislation, treaties and agreements

Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees 1951 (UN)

Deterring People Smuggling Act 2011 (Cth)

Migration Act 1958 (Cth)