

Appeal to the Australian Communications and Media Authority (ACMA)

This appeal to ACMA concerns ABC's Audience and Consumer Affairs' decision not to uphold my complaint about RN's *The Minefield* program (16 Oct 2019), in which the war in Syria was discussed.

Because the views presented in the *Minefield* program are commonly held ones and broadly reflect Australian government policy on Syria, I understand how difficult it must be for ABC Audience and Consumer Affairs as well as ACMA to uphold my complaint. Therefore, as well as sending this appeal letter to your office, I will disseminate it more widely in the hope that it generates a sorely needed discussion.

The Minefield presenters, Scott Stephens and Waleed Aly, are both highly valued members of the ABC community. They are well-informed and erudite on a broad range of subjects.

Issues presented by them in that October *Minefield* program couldn't be more weighty. According to the program's guest, Nader Hashemi, the president of Syria, with support from Iran and Russia, has been responsible for the killing of "half a million people"; the displacement of "eleven million"; a "borderline genocide"; and a "massive chemical weapons attack".

However, instead of giving such categorical claims judicious attention, *The Minefield* presenters accepted them. For example, the presenters and their guest seemed to concur that Barack Obama should have launched military strikes against Damascus in 2013 after President Assad was accused of a 'massive chemical weapons attack' which allegedly crossed Obama's 'red line'.

My complaint draws attention to a top US scientist and veteran journalists whose research challenges this mainstream narrative. They are Theodore Postol, Professor of Science, Technology and National Security Policy at MIT; Seymour Hersh, 1970 winner of the Pulitzer Prize for his reports on America's cover-up of the My Lai massacre; and the late Robert Parry, 1984 winner of the George Polk Award for national reporting.

According to Robert Parry, Obama was wise not to launch attacks against Syria. Obama's then director of national intelligence, James Clapper, had warned him it wasn't a 'slam dunk'; the Syrian army may not have been responsible for the alleged sarin gas attack. (Ref: Neocons Red-Faced Over 'Red Line', by Robert Parry, 10 March 2016)

As well as ignoring the findings of these veteran experts, *The Minefield* presenters did not consider the perspectives of millions of ordinary people in Syria. This is curious since *Minefield* listeners could fairly expect, firstly, that Stephens, editor of the ABC's *Religion and Ethics* website, would give attention to the plight of Syria's Christian population and other minority religious groups; and, secondly, that Aly, who works with Monash University's Global Terrorism Research Centre, could speak with authority about the impact on Syrians of thousands of foreign and local insurgents who, motivated by an extremist ideology, spread terror and fear. (In Boy on the Beach, Tima Kurdi recounts how her brother's experience of terror led him to flee Syria and risk the boat trip across the Mediterranean with his wife and young sons.)

Despite the seriousness of the issues, instead of investigating my complaint in an impartial and rigorous way, ABC's Audience and Consumer Affairs gave it only cursory attention. The principal reason for not upholding my complaint seems to be the trust Audience and Consumer Affairs places in the 'expertise' of *The Minefield's* presenters and their guest.

However, it was so-called experts who persuaded us that Saddam Hussein had weapons of mass destruction (WMD). In an article titled [16 Years Later, How the Press That Sold the Iraq War Got Away With It](#), *Rolling Stone* contributing editor Mark Taibbi writes, 'WMD became the archetype of a modern propaganda war'.

Reports such as those by Theodore Postol (eg, '[Possible Implications of Faulty US Technical Intelligence in the Damascus Nerve Agent Attack of August 21, 2013](#)') as well as more recent revelations about the claims of a whistleblower from the Organisation for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons (OPCW) indicate that 'chemical weapons attacks' in Syria will one day be recognised as 'the archetype of another modern propaganda war'. (Ref: [Peter Hitchens: My secret meeting with mole at the heart of The Great Poison Gas Scandal](#), 01 Dec 2019)

In 1967, Martin Luther King saw America as 'the greatest purveyor of violence in the world'. (Ref: ["Beyond Vietnam"](#)), while former Australian prime minister Malcolm Fraser, who had experience of working with American administrations during the Vietnam war, stated in a 2016 interview that the "US thinks rules are for inferior nations. It's in their DNA." (Ref: [RT's Worlds Apart](#))

Today, there is reason to be even more deeply concerned about the role America is playing on the world stage. Americans with extremist religious views, such as Secretary of State Mike Pompeo, wield enormous power. Believing in the Rapture, Pompeo is likely to be blasé about the prospect of a cataclysmic war that could destroy humankind. (Ref: [The Rapture and the Real World: Mike Pompeo Blends Beliefs and Policy](#), NYT, 30 March 2019)

Seeking the truth is made exceedingly difficult when there are 'masters and victims of information'. (Ref: [Syria: Straining Credibility](#)). Syrians have certainly been 'information victims', while Australia is allied with a 'master', effectively giving us power we shouldn't have over Syrian lives.

In the ABC Audience and Consumer Affairs' response to my complaint, *The Minefield* program makers maintained that the purview of their program is 'moral and political philosophy'. According to Yale Professor Steven Smith, "political philosophy and its quest for knowledge may be the highest tribute we pay to love". (Ref: [Introduction: What is Political Philosophy?](#))

I contend that the *Minefield* presenters did not display a 'quest for knowledge' when they discussed Syria.

Yet, we seem to have reached a point in human history when we all should be on that quest for knowledge, the highest tribute to love. This might lead us to give attention also to French philosopher Albert Camus, who had direct experience of war and terror. In his novel *The Plague*, Camus wrote,

...there can be no true goodness or true love without the utmost clear-sightedness.

(Ref: [Socrates and Syria](#))

Enclosed with this appeal letter

Please find enclosed the original complaint regarding RN's *The Minefield* program on 16 October 2019 and the response I received from Ms Reena Rihan, ABC's Audience and Consumer Affairs, on 18 November 2019.

Also, with this appeal letter, I will include a reference list, which lends support to the points made in the complaint, and a PDF document with images of just a few of the millions of Syrians whose perspectives, I believe, were ignored by *The Minefield* presenters and their guest.

RELEVANT EXTRACT from THE MINEFIELD

Below is the transcript of the part of *The Minefield* program which relates to my complaint.

Minefield guest Nader Hashemi from the University of Denver joins the two presenters Waleed Aly and Scott Stephens at 17:30 minutes into the radio program, which then finishes at 25:00 minutes. After that, *The Minefield* continues as a podcast. Matters discussed in other parts of the program or the podcast were not relevant to my complaint.

My complaint covers this last four minutes or so of the radio program. (NB: In some places, the Audience and Consumer Affairs response to my complaint lacks clarity because the respondents seem to assume I am complaining about *The Minefield* program as a whole rather than this section of the program. I used headings in my complaint letter to indicate the issues of most concern.)

After being welcomed by Scott Stephens and Waleed Aly to *The Minefield*, Nader Hashemi begins by talking about how a US president can determine American policies on Syria. There is no criticism of the US military presence in Syria, only implied criticism of Barack Obama for not ordering military strikes against Syria in 2013 and of Donald Trump for withdrawing troops from northern Syria and leaving Kurdish forces that had allied with America to possibly face a humanitarian disaster alone.

Hashemi then presents his views on the background to the situation in Syria. (I have placed key points in bold.)

Nader Hashemi:

(20:48 minutes) ...*And I am speaking specifically about the origins of Syria. I think you **have to have a political context** here and **have an appreciation for how we got to this crisis**, how Syria is once again front and centre in our political and moral consciousness and it's tugging at our heart strings.*

*And that has to do with **the events that began in 2011** in the context of **the Arab Spring and the horrific response pursued by Bashar Al- Assad and his (21:14) regional allies, Iran and his main international ally Russia** that sort of **led to a borderline genocide**; that **he's killed half a million people** that **he's displaced 11 million people**, but half of them refugees. And now back again, we're watching another*

phase of this conflict unfold. You know how Bernie Sanders would have responded to that series of events is unknown but we do know how Barack Obama responded and he responded with a set of narrow and, I think, misguided calculations that has simply produced the crisis that we are seeing right now. It has allowed for the level of human suffering in Syria to rise exponentially as a result of the decisions to view Syria very narrowly.

The position that the Obama Administration took in 2013 at that pivotal moment, **in the summer of 2013**, when there was **a massive chemical weapons attack** on the suburbs of Damascus (Waleed Aly: Hmmm) **that killed over a thousand people, about half of them children, (Waleed Aly: "The red line incident")** Yeah, the red line that he drew and said that if it is crossed it will lead to a serious recalculation of American interests. The policy decision that the White House at that time took under Barack Obama's leadership was that Syria just doesn't matter, it doesn't affect core American national interests, **It might be a humanitarian catastrophe, it might be a borderline genocide**, but so what. What happens in Syria the Obama Administration foreign policy team concluded will stay in Syria and of course **that was the biggest miscalculation, I would argue, of his presidency because it obviously ... the conflict did not stay in Syria**, it produced and contributed to the ISIS crisis, it led to a massive refugee problem that destabilised Europe, contributed to the rise of right-wing political parties, contributed to the Brexit vote. And I would argue the conflict in Syria also indirectly led to the rise of Donald Trump. He played the Syrian refugee card to his advantage to scare people that these potential terrorists are all coming to our country.

So these are policy decisions, you know, like I said, it's easy to dump Trump, and I'm all in favour of that, I live in Trump's America, I've been very critical of him. It's very easy to criticise what Erdogan is doing but I think if you want a proper context in the sense of how we got to this place particularly from the perspective of great power policy and US foreign policy toward the regime we cannot and should not ignore **the very disastrous policies that the Obama Administration** made while they were in office and that have directly contributed to this current moment of crisis.

Aly: Wow. Scot, we have a minute. Do you want to set up for the podcast?

APPEAL TO ACMA

As I contended in my complaint letter, this particular *Minefield* program breaches ABC standards related to **Accuracy, Impartiality and Diversity of Perspectives**.

The presenters of 'The Minefield':

- do not make a reasonable effort to ensure that material facts presented are accurate;
- accept content presented as fact that will materially mislead the audience;
- do not present information with due impartiality;
- do not present a range of perspectives (e.g. they ignore the perspective of the victims of insurgents and Syrian women who value the personal freedoms a secular state guarantees them).

Impartiality and Diversity of Perspective

My contention that *The Minefield* program is biased and does not consider a range of perspectives was dismissed by ABC's Audience and Consumer Affairs on the grounds that my 'complaint made unsupported claims around impartiality and diversity of perspectives'.

The complaint challenged the underlying premise of *The Minefield* discussion that a US president is better able to determine fair outcomes for the people of Syria than Syrians.

It also challenged presumptions of *The Minefield* presenters and guest that include:

1. When it comes to Syria, an impartial, indefatigable search for the truth is not necessary because the only important truth is 'Assad' is the evil player in the Syrian war and the US would be right to take military action against him;
2. Syrians who oppose US bombing of their country must be 'Assad' supporters and so should be ignored;
3. The claims made by Nader Hashemi are incontrovertible, so ABC listeners do not need to be made aware of the contrary perspectives of veteran world renowned experts, such as Professor Theodore Postol, Seymour Hersh or the late Robert Parry;
4. The violence and terror of tens of thousands of foreign and local Islamist insurgents has been immaterial and their ideology is benign making it unnecessary to give attention to the perspectives of Syrians impacted by their terror and fearful of their particular brand of Islam;
5. Syrian women who cherish the freedoms a secular state guarantees them have no reason to fear the loss of that state and the victory of insurgents funded by Saudi Arabia and/or Qatar.

In any discussion about the war in Syria that purports to be dealing with moral and philosophical questions, it would be imperious to ignore Syrian perspectives, but they are ignored in this *Minefield* program. Furthermore, *Minefield* listeners were misled when the presenters and guest also ignored the perspectives of highly esteemed experts whose research calls into question the above presumptions.

Dr Jeremy Salt, a retired Australian academic and author of 'The Unmaking of the Middle East', wrote in 2012,

In this proxy war being waged by outside governments the wellbeing of the Syrian people is not even a consideration.

(Ref: 'Magician's Diversion: Bleeding Syria to Death')

In the online complaint form with its word limit, I was unable to provide references. However, a simple Internet search by the ABC Audience and Consumer Affairs unit would have demonstrated the veracity of my claims and pointed to the unconscionable bias of *Minefield* presenters and their guest, who, for their own peculiar reasons, ignore the wellbeing of the Syrian people.

Professor Nader Hashemi - biased or not?

The disinformation disseminated by US and UK officials and, as a consequence, by media outlets in the lead up to the war in Iraq should lead us to suspect there are lies being promulgated in the mainstream media and by politicians about the war in Syria.

In Ms Rihan's email, much is made of Nader Hashemi's supposed 'expertise', as if this should give us reason to defer to his views on Syria. I note that Nader Hashemi is a director at the Josef Korbel School of International Studies, University of Denver, a school which has strong links to very powerful political players in America including Madeleine Albright (the daughter of Josef Korbel); Condoleezza Rice (an alumni); and a former US Ambassador to Iraq, Christopher Robert Hill, who was dean of the School until recently. Hashemi's connection with the powerful US 'establishment' that pushes for regime change wars should point to a need for alternative views being referenced so ABC listeners can be equipped to 'make up their own minds'.

Professor Tim Hayward from Edinburgh University recently wrote a lengthy, well-researched paper on Syria. In it, he cautions us not to draw glib conclusions on Syria, such as I contend the presenters of *The Minefield* do. Professor Hayward writes,

'The pursuit of justice requires great scrupulousness of method and honesty of intent; it entails respecting the presumption of innocence, ensuring procedures are impartial and consistent, with due transparency and openness.'

(Ref: 'Caesar' evidence for atrocities in Syria: what does justice require? April 2019)

It is this scrupulous and impartial seriousness of purpose that ABC listeners would expect from *Minefield* program makers who claim their 'purview is moral and political philosophy'. But *The Minefield* presenters betray the trust of their listeners when they discuss Syria.

The Placement of Blame

Under this section of my complaint letter, I stated that the presenters of *The Minefield*, in not challenging Nader Hashemi, ignore the complexity of the war in Syria.

I list a number of important features of the war that ABC listeners could fairly expect to be given consideration by an 'expert' on Syria and presenters tasked with discussing matters from a moral and philosophical standpoint. (The reference list with this Appeal covers these features.)

For example, I give attention to acts of terror Syrians have experienced over the course of the war and I name two prominent clerics who have promoted terror against both soldiers and civilians. (One Australian who contributed directly to the terror experienced by Syrians was the father of a seven-year-old boy photographed holding up the severed head of a Syrian soldier.)

The fact that *The Minefield* gives no attention to the matters I listed points to its bias toward US foreign policy on Syria and its ignoring a diversity of perspectives.

In response to my complaint, Ms Rihan from Audience and Consumer Affairs writes, '**While we have noted your personal interpretation of the events and your assertion that the program did not provide a detailed enough summary, it was reasonable for the program to rely on Professor Hashemi's acknowledged expertise first**'

Ms Rihan does not acknowledge that I was listing critical facts (supported in the reference list included with this appeal) that one would expect an impartial scholar or philosopher to have considered when attributing blame. In my complaint, I did not assert that 'the program did not provide a detailed enough summary', as she suggests. What I was calling for was genuine impar-

tial scholarship and fairness to relevant perspectives, with special regard for women in Syria, who would cherish the freedoms guaranteed by the secular state institutions.

I refer to objective and rigorous analysis by academics, investigative journalists and scientists that contrasts with what I describe as the 'one-dimensional' views presented in this *Minefield* program. Describing the views presented in this *Minefield* program as 'one-dimensional', I believe, is the extent of my 'personal interpretation'.

The response of the ABC's Audience and Consumer Affairs suggests that those who investigated my complaint deferred to the program makers rather than conducted the serious, genuinely independent investigation the issues demanded from this ABC body.

A 'Borderline Genocide'

The deliberate killing of a large group of people, especially those of a particular religious or ethnic group might be described as a 'genocide'.

In *The Minefield* program Nader Hashemi implies that Bashar al-Assad and his allies - Iran and Russia - are responsible for what he refers to as a 'borderline genocide'. *The Minefield* presenters do not ask him to clarify; the ABC audience is left to deduce what he might mean.

Most ABC *Minefield* listeners would know that the Syrian president is an Alawite Muslim while they would know that insurgents mostly present as Sunni Muslims. Therefore, listeners would most likely assume Hashemi is claiming a 'borderline genocide' is being committed by Alawites against Sunni Muslims.

To claim that Syria's president and two nation states are committing something which resembles genocide is a serious charge; many in the West might consider this justification for military action against Syria, Russia and Iran. Some in the Australian Muslim community might believe it calls for a 'jihad'. For these reasons, it would be grossly improper to make this charge without substantial cause.

In my complaint, I point out the nonsense in Hashemi's inference because the majority of Syrian soldiers would be Sunni Muslims (reflecting the fact that it is mainly a conscription army and around 75% of Syrians are Sunni Muslims). Moreover, the majority of members of parliament are Sunni as is the president's wife and so his in-laws. Prominent Sunnis include the prime minister, the foreign minister, the vice-president, and the president's top intelligence adviser. The business elite is majority Sunni.

The army and the Syrian people could not stay united if the government promoted hatred toward Sunnis and thus committed 'a borderline genocide' against Sunnis. It is illogical. (NB: there are different 'schools' of Sunni Islam, which complicates such a discussion further.)

My complaint points to evidence of genocidal-type hatred toward Alawites including the massacre of Alawite villagers by insurgents to point out that Hashemi's claim is disingenuous.

The evidence I present of the promotion of genocidal hatred toward Alawites is brushed aside by Ms Rihan. She doesn't see the significance of the Al-Jazeera program I refer to, a program

with millions of viewers that effectively condones the murder of Alawites, including women and children. Such views are reminiscent of Nazis views on Jewish people; they promote genocide, making it very relevant indeed to any responsible philosophical discussion about Syria. (Ref: [Aljazeera Arabic: Should We Kill All Alawites?](#))

On this point and others, the response from ABC's Audience and Consumer Affairs is slight, depending on a blind trust in Hashemi's 'expertise' and perhaps a simple collegial trust in *The Minefield* program makers, who are directly quoted in Ms Rihan's email. Again, this calls into question the independence of the ABC's Audience and Consumer Affairs body.

"(Assad's) killed half a million people"

"(Assad's) displaced 11 million people, half of them refugees"

Ms Rihan writes,

We have **noted your objection to the statistics** used by Professor Hashemi, again as globally recognised specialist it was appropriate for the program to rely on his expertise on the situation including his knowledge of scholarship in the area and his assessment of the veracity or applicability of counterclaims. We further note, according to the United Nations there are approximately 5.7 million registered Syrian refugees and approximately 6.6 million internally displaced people (<https://data2.unhcr.org/en/situations/syria>; <https://www.unhcr.org/syria-emergency.html>).

Ms Rihan is mistaken to claim I object to the 'statistics' used by Professor Hashemi. I did not. My complaint questions the crude conclusions Hashemi draws from these statistics. In my complaint letter I noted there was no analysis of the casualty figures or attention given to victims of terror.

I state that Hashemi's accusation that '(Assad's) killed half a million people' does not reflect objective scholarship. I present well-considered reasons for this assertion, but they are ignored by Ms Rihan and the program makers.

The presenters of *The Minefield* do not make 'a reasonable effort to ensure that material facts presented are accurate', or at the very least qualified. Hashemi's claims are accepted by the presenters as fact although they 'materially mislead the audience'. Moreover, they reflect a contempt for the people of Syria who have stood up to the terror and violence of the tens of thousands of foreign insurgents that have entered their country illegally.

The alleged chemical attack and Obama's 'red line'

The response of the ABC Audience and Consumer Affairs unit to the points I raised under this heading is both inadequate and misleading. Ms Rihan casually dismisses the investigative work of world renowned scientists and investigative journalists I reference and at the same time belittles my complaint when she writes,

'We have noted your views that the chemical attack has been disputed by some, however, ...'

Ms Rihan quotes from a United Nations report that stated that there was 'clear and convincing evidence that surface-to-surface rockets containing the nerve gas Sarin were used in Ein Tarma, Moadamiyah and Zamalka in the Ghouta area of Damascus'. My complaint letter does not challenge this finding in the UN report. I accept that UN inspectors discovered evidence of Sarin gas

use. However, the UN didn't attribute blame, which should have been noted by Audience and Consumer Affairs; it is significant:

Report of the independent international commission of inquiry on the Syrian Arab Republic, General Assembly, 12 Feb 2014

Paragraph 6 of Summary (12/2/14) states, 'Chemical weapons, specifically sarin, were found to have been used in multiple incidents during the conflict. **In no incident was the commission's evidentiary threshold met with respect to the perpetrator.**

In such a circumstance, the research and analyses of world renowned scientists and investigative journalists deserved attention in *The Minefield*. This is particularly true when it is conceivable that those responsible for the murders of hundreds of people, including scores of children, were insurgents who were protected in an 'information war' against Syrians by America and its allies, so by our government and national broadcaster.

Ms Rihan continues,

While you may personally disagree with the findings of the United Nations, Audience and Consumer Affairs remain satisfied that within the context of this discussion it is not materially misleading for Professor Hashemi to reference "the pivotal moment in the summer of 2013 when there was a massive chemical weapons attack in the suburbs of Damascus."

I contend Hashemi is materially misleading the ABC audience precisely because of the context of the discussion. Prior to mentioning the 'massive chemical weapons attack', Hashemi claims that Bashar al-Assad has "killed half a million people" and "he's displaced eleven million people". Although Hashemi doesn't specifically say the Syrian president was responsible for the 'massive chemical weapons attack', *The Minefield* listeners would fairly assume he blames the president because of what he has already claimed are the crimes of the president and because of his silence on the terror of insurgents despite many being affiliated with ISIS or Al-Qaeda.

Hashemi and *The Minefield* presenters also imply criticism of Obama for not taking military action against Syria following the alleged CW attack. As I do, Hashemi would know that James Clapper cautioned Obama against action, saying it wasn't a 'slam-dunk'. Therefore, it is disingenuous of Hashemi and the presenters to mislead the ABC audience as they do. In agreeing with Hashemi, *The Minefield* presenters are either curiously ill-informed on this matter or else choose to take a partisan stand that would collapse under close examination.

My complaint also refers to the rigorous analysis of the late Dr Denis O'Brien into the alleged sarin attack. After a 6-month study of videos made available to the US Congress, Dr O'Brien's expertise led him to conclude that the victims displayed symptoms that pointed to either carbon monoxide or cyanide gas poisoning, definitely not sarin. He contended that one or other of these deadly gases must have been released from cylinders that he noticed in the rooms with victims. Thus, he concludes they were not killed by a CW attack but most probably by their jailers, namely, by 'rebels'. His conclusion does not contradict the UN report. Small traces of sarin could have been strategically placed by insurgents for UN inspectors to discover. (Credible reports from Turkey point to ISIS militants in Syria having had access to sarin.)

Although *The Minefield* presenters and guest ignore the research of scientists of the calibre of Professor Ted Postol and veteran award-winning investigative journalists Seymour Hersh and

Robert Parry, it should have been incumbent upon ABC's Audience and Consumer Affairs to give some credence to their rigorous research and conclusions, or at least respectful attention.

Conclusion

The stand taken by *Minefield* presenters and guest on Syria was unequivocal, one more reflective of partisan players than academics or philosophers. It avoided the cautious approach of experts I reference, and even of BBC World News editor Jon Williams, who wrote in June 2012,

Given the difficulties of reporting inside Syria, video filed by the opposition on Twitter, Facebook and YouTube may provide some insight into the story on the ground. But stories are never black and white - often shades of grey. Those opposed to President Assad have an agenda. One senior Western official went as far as to describe their YouTube communications strategy as "brilliant". But he also likened it to so-called "psy-ops", brainwashing techniques used by the US and other military to convince people of things that may not necessarily be true.

A healthy scepticism is one of the essential qualities of any journalist - never more so than in reporting conflict. The stakes are high - all may not always be as it seems.

(Ref: [Reporting conflict in Syria](#), by Jon Williams)

The *Minefield* presenters and guest did not display any sign of a healthy scepticism.

I contend that ABC standards relating to accuracy, impartiality and a range of perspectives were breached in *The Minefield* program broadcast on 16 October 2019 and the response of ABC's Audience and Consumer Affairs was inadequate. It was clearly biased toward the claims of the program makers and their guest. Audience and Consumer Affairs failed to investigate my complaint with the independence and rigour it deserved because of the graveness of its subject matter and the possible ramifications of the breaches.

As stated above, the presenters of 'The Minefield':

- do not make a reasonable effort to ensure that material facts presented are accurate;
- accept content presented as fact that will materially mislead the audience;
- do not present information with due impartiality;
- do not present a range of perspectives (e.g. they ignore the perspective of the victims of insurgents and Syrian women who value the personal freedoms a secular state guarantees them).

Please do not hesitate to contact me if you require further information.

Regards,

Ms Susan Dirgham

English as a Second Language teacher

Website: [Socrates and Syria](#)