Dear Greg

DIRECTING LIBERALISM'S THIRD WAVE THROUGH OUR PRINCIPAL BEEF WITH JUDGE KIRBY

Your suggestions increase problems you seek to reduce: Help the NSW Premier to gain open government, abolish the Australian Law Reform Commission and set up more effective forms of dispute resolution to cut cost and simplify government

Following your order in your speech to the Sydney Institute (6.4.2011) on Liberalism's Third Wave, which deals with individual fulfilment and the simplification of government, I refer first to your six year old daughter, Poppy, who may need a little smack on the hand if she will not pick up the millipedes on the floor for free. You should point out to her that she is alive because you support her and she needs to contribute to the household to grow up to be a responsible adult. Family life is ideally conceived as a shared moral relationship, not a trading relationship where children are bribed to perform small tasks. You may be creating a manipulative, self interested little monster. At a national level, understanding of the ideal moral nature of family life is particularly necessary for better international coordination and management of Australian and Asian retirement funds which are ideally also managed to promote more stable returns on greener investments, in the interests of current and future generations. In China, for example, the economic support of aged parents by their children is required by law. The necessity to provide more stable social services for the aged is well recognized, especially by the vocal young.

You claim the third wave of liberal reform is 'the revolution in simplifying government and consumer choice through deep competition reform' and state 'the deadweight losses from avoidable modern bureaucracy and barriers to competition are enormous'. The main aim of Liberalism's third wave appears to be to reduce the waste of time and cost which occurs through unnecessarily complex bureaucratic activity which also hinders competition. For reasons given later, your reform suggestions will not achieve your aims.

See the attached submission to the NSW Premier and others on how to gain more broadly and effectively coordinated planning and investment which addresses the problems of complexity and bureaucratic barriers to competition which concern us both. Doing so depends on open, low risk investment partnerships designed to achieve key social and environmental as well as economic goals. The NSW Premier claims he will dramatically increase public scrutiny of government infrastructure planning by setting up a major projects advisory board and promises to release cost-benefit analyses for big developments (Australian Financial Review (AFR 18.4.2011, p. 1). Help him do so.

A Senate Committee inquiry into the Australian Law Reform Commission (ALRC) has recently recommended that the government restore ALRC budget cuts as a matter of urgency. You should begin to cut waste by calling for abolition of the ALRC as it has often been a worse than useless body which only generates more secrecy, expense and confusion while doing nothing to achieve the key aims under Section 21 of the ALRC Act which sets out its functions. These include reviewing law to make it meet current

need; removing defects in law; simplifying it and adopting new or more effective methods for administering the law and dispensing justice. This is discussed again later.

The ALRC usually parrots the feudal past to complicate law further. For example, the Review of Privacy Issues Paper No. 31 (2006) states the ALRC was asked to undertake a Review of the Privacy Act (1998). One cannot logically meet the terms of reference of the review, which asked about changing community perceptions of privacy, without going beyond the boundaries of the act itself, which neither defines nor gives reasons for privacy. The ALRC issues paper indicates that the review of the Privacy Act should be done without seeing the act as a product of a broader social environment. Undertaking an inquiry whilst apparently blinkered by the act which is supposedly under inquiry is not an intelligent approach to problem identification and solving. It is like doing a review of the Bible which is constrained by the need to follow the Bible. Nevertheless, the OECD guidelines on privacy, referred to early by the ALRC, seem good to me. Attention is particularly drawn to the OECD openness principle, and to the view that privacy is ideally the right of the individual, as distinct from the right of groups or corporations.

The attached submission to the ALRC Review of Client Legal Privilege and Federal Investigatory Bodies questions the ALRC view that, *'the protection of the confidentiality of communications between a lawyer and a client facilitates compliance with the law and access to a fair hearing in curial and non-curial contexts, thereby serving the broad public interest in the effective administration of justice'* (p. 207). The ALRC states its view, (that secrecy facilitates legal compliance rather than legal non-compliance), is highly contested and neither side has evidence in support. It nevertheless recommends major extensions of the lawyers' privilege. The global financial crisis, which hardly any legal and financial 'experts' predicted, has been foisted upon Australians by related legal interests since. More openness is necessary for good governance and the ALRC has usually fought this.

The report 'Essentially Yours' and related papers on the protection of human genetic information were clear and informative. However, the ALRC produced them with the National Health and Medical Research Council (NHMRC). If the NHMRC had worked with the Productivity Commission (PC), the knowledge could have been better coordinated by more openly consultative and historically informed people than lawyers, who wield a repulsive and expensive feudal paradigm which produces endless red tape.

The Law and Justice Evaluation Issues Paper (2010), produced as part of the Independent Review of Aid Effectiveness, also shows lawyers have no idea of the meaning and importance of identifying the **key** stakeholders (those who use and who pay for services) in any policy or project management. They want instead to treat all stakeholders as equally important, which privileges the legal and financial interests battening off the rest.

Problems in regard to your suggestions are addressed below, followed by further discussion of the ALRC and the stultifying effects of the legal paradigm on innovation. Support the development direction addressed in the attached article entitled 'A healthier approach to justice and environment development in Australian communities and beyond', which was printed in Public Administration Today (2006). This shows that

social and environment development are at the centre of a new international governance paradigm which also raises risk management to new importance. Implementation of this paradigm requires broad administrative reform in Australia and beyond to meet the evidentiary requirements of more scientific and quality management. Recommendations for the development of better dispute resolution systems are made in this context.

SUGGESTION 1

To simplify government you first propose to create an Independent Commission on Tax Reform and Simplification. This new bureaucracy would probably only increase the huge numbers of tax lawyers asking each other to add to all the enduring legal complexities and costs which are already the most stifling problems for the Australian people. Bodies composed largely of lawyers that pretend to address the interests of the public will never do it other than at huge cost and delay as they follow pre-scientific, anti-democratic assumptions and related practices which are often centred on the supposed legitimacy of their secret operations. **The PC should do any tax inquiry instead.**

There are 55 bodies which currently have responsibility for regulating the Australian legal profession and the National Legal Profession Reform Project is poised to add some more. Occupational groups and sub-groups, especially those driven stupidly by feudal rather than scientific assumptions, should not self-regulate and cannot regulate others well. They should be openly managed in related industry and community contexts. To accept legal self regulation and related regulation of taxation according to feudal principles only increases the problems of opaque bureaucracy and cost that you are now trying to address.

Many unclear management duties proposed for the new National Legal Services Board in the draft Legal Profession National Law make one wonder how the Board will affect the other 55 legal regulatory bodies referred to fleetingly by the National Legal Profession Reform Taskforce. One wonders what is wanted from the Board and what powers, if any, it has over any others. The Board appears powerless in spite of the draft Law's statement, among many contradictory others, that it has all the powers to perform its functions.

The attached submission responding to the Council of Australian Government's (COAG) National Legal Profession Reform Taskforce Consultation Report (2010) firstly shows that there is a key distinction between national standards and national uniformity. The effective achievement of the former should be sought by COAG, but neither can be attained by the draft Legal Profession National Law. Taskforce questions on professional indemnity insurance, fidelity fund cover, continuing professional development requirements, disclosure and charging of legal costs, and the appropriate management of all trust money and accounts are also considered in related national and regional contexts. All these issues are central to discussions of simplifying government, cutting cost and creating more open, stable and protective management of funds. Address these issues with appropriate professional bodies and others to obtain more openly directed fund management which is more clearly in the public and individual interest.

SUGGESTION 2

Your second suggestion to simplify government is to set up an Independent Office of Expenditure Review. Your off the cuff discussion is far from compelling and one wonders how it will affect the states. Quality management requires:

1. Consultative development of clear program and related project aims and objectives (with or without numerical targets)
2. Clear strategies to achieve the program aims and the related project objectives
3. The provision of the budgets necessary to undertake the program and its project/s
4. Monitoring of project performance and evaluation of the outcomes
5. Clear accountabilities for program and project management and expenditure

Apparently your suggestion follows Malcolm Turnbull's idea, adopted from the US, of a Parliamentary Budget Officer. The Chair of the Business Council of Australia has also proposed a 'permanent independent commission' with the capacity to 'assess federal spending programs'. Opaque US market operations allowed financial service providers rather than financial service consumers to drive the global financial crisis. Given the complexity and cost problems created by related Australian legal and financial paradigms discussed later, your suggestion is likely to add to bureaucracy and cost. Open and bipartisan discussion and agreement on some key regional project aims and related expenditures designed in the interests of all Australians is a better way forward.

Your suggestions for an **Integrated Planning Commission for Melbourne** and for related projects were made in another speech. This Commission seems yet another bureaucratic and cost addition. One wonders how it is expected to related to the City of Sydney's Sustainable Sydney 2030 vision, outlined recently by Lord Mayor Clover Moore in the Utzon Lecture at the University of NSW or to directions in other major cities. Superficially the projects you propose appear to be representing the interests of the road transport and medical research lobbies as well as special interests in the Mornington Peninsula where you live. Australian regional trains are the latest I have been on anywhere, in comparison with Japan, Europe, China, Russia and Mongolia, where trains arrived on time, not hours late. This seems a major national problem. You appear mainly to be adding to all the greenhouse gas problems related to preferring roads.

SUGGESTION 3

Thirdly, in order to remove barriers to 'participation, investment and competition' you suggest creation of a Family Advocate system in which individuals or families engaged with government welfare or employment services should have the option of working with a Family Advocate, to 'help them manage their way through the thicket of government'. The Family Advocate would supposedly operate like a GP in diagnosing the problem, suggesting the solution and referring to the relevant specialist within government. Without better understanding and treatment of how feudal legal and economic assumptions shape and undermine effective modern governance, the Family Advocate proposal risks adding to the number of people now wandering around unwilling or unable to find any persons who might solve their clients'

supposed problems. On the other hand, these new family advocates would now also have an interest in clinging inside some new collegiate silo, inevitably topped by lawyers.

It is ironic that the reduction in the influence of trade unions in Australian has been accompanied by the rise of more powerfully vested legal, financial and related professional interests which also brought the global financial crisis and the problems of complexity, cost and related business and consumer incapacity you seek to address. The way forward may be partly addressed in discussions with non-profit industry superannuation funds such as UniSuper, which should openly design low risk green investment and related employment, training and research options. Problems related to addressing life mainly as a medical project, innovation and patents are addressed later.

SUGGESTION 4

In order to remove regulatory barriers for businesses you want to create 'a one-stop' government where possible. In particular you seek a 'Single Entry Point for Business Approvals by 2020'. The Greiner government came to power in NSW determined to bring such marvels to the people. Has the situation got better for business since? I doubt it. One needs to face and grasp the legal nettles firmly to destroy them.

In this context note the vital contribution of Professor Christian List of the London School of Economics to the Sydney Ideas debate on 'The authority of science: Is science just another voice in the policy debate?' (8.4.2011). His view is contained in the attached advice to the NSW Premier, ministers and other organizations. List contrasts the concept of aggregative democracy with deliberative democracy and prefers the latter. Deliberative democracy assumes that the combination of belief and the related desire to make rational decisions should drive development directions, rather than the aggregation of particular numbers being the main driver. List's distinction between two democratic forms also provides the capacity for belief and more scientific approaches to evidence to drive development regionally and universally. In contrast to List's view, Brown's biography of Michael Kirby suggests the ALRC founder sees the UN and its instruments as baubles of English common law, which particularly suits our lawyers. The UN naturally questions Kirby's view of the shared heritage of British (sic.) colonies as the basis for transferring and absorbing human rights and as part of an enlightened vision of a universal order.

Because forms of insurance are all so different from each other (e.g. some are third party and some are not) one wonders if your brief suggestion for **single package insurance** would be designed to work in the public interest rather than against it. For example, if one is paying an insurance premium for health services for oneself and family, one may willingly pay more to ensure the services are of the quality one wishes. However, when paying third party insurance one normally only sees an interest in obtaining the cheapest possible premium. High levels of competition between private sector insurance underwriters may lead to the unintended consequence of insurer insolvency and inability to meet claims when the market cycle turns. This was the key problem which was addressed in the re-design of Australian workers compensation in the 1980s. It was recognized ***industry and government ownership of premium pools is vital to ensure***

effective competition between insurance companies contracted to deliver the necessary premium collection, injury prevention, rehabilitation, and data gathering services.

SUGGESTION 5

Whilst agreeing with your proposal that one normally likes **a single service bill, with all the related itemized costs on it, in order to plan the provision of services such as those in health care clearly and cost-effectively for consumers and communities,** your discussion then veers from addressing insurance to addressing 'utilities, such as electricity, gas and water'. I broadly understand how casemix pricing provisions in Australian health care and workers compensation insurance have been designed and managed since the 1980s to overcome many earlier problems of being driven in markets where service providers rather than consumers and governments rule. However, I have no idea of the extent to which electricity, gas and water should ideally be designed and treated as similar services. For example, the **'vertical monopolies'** which you refer to are not normally discussed much in regard to health care policy and provision.

Medicare was constructed as a national fund and service provider to put downward pressure on prices all private sector service providers charge. Medicare does so by providing basic health services to all consumers for free or at lower cost than those provided in the private sector. Comparison of US and Australian health care shows the Australian monopolistic approach has provided us with cheaper, more accessible and equitable health care. Better data which could improve performance outcomes is also available nationally. The National Health and Hospitals Reform Commission (NHHRC) recommendation for development of a person-controlled electronic personal health record is a vital step in national, more openly evidence-based service delivery in future.

However, in the Word Health Organization (WHO) Declaration of Alma-Ata, primary health care 'involves, in addition to the health sector, all related sectors and aspects of community development, in particular agriculture, animal husbandry, food, industry, education, housing, public works, communications and other sectors; and demands the coordinated efforts of all those sectors'. The related WHO approach to healthy action sees all work, play and related living as located in regional communities and environments from which risks and many related environmental challenges arise and are ideally prioritized for remedial action. The identification and control of the major risks to health are ideally also conducted in this regional context. The health problems people face often result from poor diet, lack of exercise, smoking, unemployment, alcohol, accidents and work. Better solutions for mental health problems are likely to be found in tackling social and environment development problems. Instead of this they appear increasingly deemed medical to control them, which is scary. Delivering drugs and questionnaires poses as scientific but often has more in common with social sciences.

Health care provision has been increasingly designed by government ideally to protect the consumers of health care and the Australian community. This provision is based on completely different assumptions about government and trading operations than those found in the Trade Practices Act (TPA) and other financial legislation. In regard to your

discussion of health care, electricity, gas and water, one wonders how you define 'a utility' and a 'vertical monopoly' and why the latter may be dangerous. Get PC advice.

SUGGESTION 6

I do not know what you mean by **'we should consider voluntary wholesale separation in return for the right to offer all-in-one insurance or utility packages'. You propose the PC be given a general reference to identify the opportunities for and barriers to improving retail competition through voluntary wholesale separation out to 2020.** Although I do not understand you I am also confident the PC can shed light on the issues instead of obscuring them so that they are incomprehensible to all who are not lawyers. The National Health and Hospitals Reform Commission report was very useful but also contained many special pleadings by vested medical and related collegiate interests.

In this context, note that in its inquiry into telecommunications competition regulation, the PC returned to Hilmer's report on national competition policy in questioning the principles which lawyers in the Australian Competition and Consumer Commission were pursuing. The PC concluded there is an inherent difficulty in defining anti-competitive conduct in an objective sense and it is not possible to undertake a full benefit cost analysis of the merits of anti-competitive conduct regulation. It stated lack of transparency in the Trade Practices Act also limits the ability of telecommunications providers and the community to analyse and comment. The PC's attitude to its own inquiry into allegations of unfair use of market power in telecommunications was summed up in its quote from the Hilmer Report:

> The central conundrum in addressing the problem of misuse of market power is that the problem is not well defined or apparently amenable to clear definition…. …….Even if particular types of conduct can be named, it does not seem possible to define them, or the circumstances in which they should be treated as objectionable, with any great precision……**Faced with this problem……..the challenge is to provide a system which can distinguish between desirable and undesirable activity while providing an acceptable level of business certainty** (My italics)**.** (PC, 2001, p. 154)

The Treasurer has also stated that what the Australian business community wants most is certainty about the direction of carbon pollution reduction plans and the carbon price. The design of low risk green investment models is also vital in this context.

A recent PC paper distinguished between economic and social regulations. Economic regulations like the Trade Practices Act (TPA) 'intervene directly in market decisions such as pricing, competition, market entry or exit'. Social regulations 'protect public interests such as health, safety, the environment and social cohesion.'(2008, p.5). Such a distinction between economic and social regulation is wrong, because economic activity is undertaken ultimately with the social aim of supporting life and its associations. Like the TPA, the distinction reflects the outdated assumption that competition is always for money and that the greatest number of market players provides the ideal conditions for the contest, which can only do everybody good. In this paradigm, the consumer may be conceived as being like any other kind of trader or totally ignored. In the TPA, the

consumer is treated in a comparatively recent addition to the act. This does little or nothing to rectify the wrong and outdated central assumptions on which the TPA rests.

In 1993, Hilmer recognized the ruling distinction between economic and social regulation was conceptually unacceptable when he defined competition as, 'striving or potential striving of two or more persons or organizations against one another for the same or related objects'(1993, p.2). This denies the legal assumption that competition can only ever be for money. Hilmer pointed out that earlier Australian legislation related to competition follows the US Sherman Antitrust Act of 1890 (1993, p.8). This stated that all 'unfair' business 'monopolizations' and 'combinations' are against the consumer and related national interest. In 'American Capitalism, The Concept of Countervailing Power', Galbraith pointed out that, 'To suppose that there are grounds for antitrust prosecution whenever three, four or a half a dozen firms dominate a market is to suppose that the very fabric of American capitalism is illegal'(1952, p.68). He also pointed out that this has never discouraged the lawyer. We live with the expensive legal consequences.

Hilmer's view of competition assumes national goals may best be reached through attempts to satisfy related regional social and environmental aims. Ideally, services to meet these goals are then priced and delivered openly and transparently. Comparative evaluation of service outcomes may teach everybody how to perform better in future. Performance depends on what consumers and those who fund them seek in a variety of regional environments and circumstances, which ideally may also support many niche markets. Hilmer's direction was lost in the translation to older prescriptive laws which typically have no clear aims and definitions suited to guiding regional partnerships in gaining more scientific and democratic management practice and service delivery.

However, 'efficient market theory' drove us to the global financial crisis. It assumes all necessary information about a commodity (a share or other investment) is reflected in its price. It also assumes sectional financial interests drive all the surrounding social and environmental interests most effectively and that pursuit of financial interests is in the interests of all in the longer run, where it is also assumed markets will clear perfectly. The fact that booms and slumps continue, that markets are widening socio-economic differences instead of reducing them, and that global biodiversity is rapidly being destroyed, shows these key financial and legal assumptions are wrong and will also harm future generations. Nevertheless, such assumptions are reflected in many Australian laws which also privilege commercial secrecy. The global financial crisis also showed this financial dogma led closer to perfect ignorance than perfect information, at growing cost.

ATTACK THE ALRC AND HELP INNOVATION IN OPEN DEVELOPMENT

The ALRC was established in 1975 and headed by Michael Kirby. Brown (2011) argues that in his leading role in the ALRC, Kirby was clear in his own mind that his personal philosophies about law reform were much more limited and traditionalist than his paradoxical public reputation as a social reformer. However, in his later working life Kirby said that anything should be supported which raised the consciousness of 'a rather

parochial people' concerning the need for international cooperation (p. 226) and also became an increasingly open gay crusader. His brainchild the ALRC is best abolished.

Gaudron and Kirby agree that a problem with the English legal system has always been that it 'did not, at any stage, while England owned the common law descend to the identification of principle' (Brown, 2011 p. 363). Kelly emailed Kirby after the latter had published lectures which repeated a 1922 description of the common law as 'a monument slowly raised, like a coral reef, from the minute accretions of past individuals'. Kirby acknowledge this made for a 'semi-chaotic, intermittent creation' rather than a perfect science, but he still viewed a perfect science as possible and desirable. Kelly, a colleague of Kirby's at the ALRC, suggested there was 'more to life' than 'trying to make sense of a legal system that is inherently unscientific and absurd'. Kirby replied:

> Dear David…….How dare you say law is absurd when it was you who taught me to treat is as a conceptual unity. (p. 363)

Lawyers appear as the richest and most powerful elite whose concealment, pretences, confusions and in-jokes corrupt all around them. As in an abusive marriage, they appear determined to be all we have to support us. **One wonders about their effects on police.**

Brown argues that Kirby 'took comfort from the shared heritage of British (sic.) colonies as a basis for transferring and absorbing human rights as 'part of an enlightened vision of universal order' (p. 260). However, UN leaders told Kirby that 'some developing countries were suspicious of the international movement for human rights protection 'as a reflection of Western attempts at hegemony, paralleling the economic intrusion of multinational corporations'. They thought that cultural norms were at risk (p. 258). Australians should consider how our money and sensible development are held at risk by so many powerfully unaccountable creatures, seeking enrichment through legal careers.

Speaking on Tibet, Kirby apparently assumed that 'environmentalism is distinct from humanism' and also stated 'diversity is the protectress of freedom' (p. 232). In fact, the rights of future generations appear to depend upon the protection of diverse natural environments and freedom to choose the traditional or other ways of life also depend upon protection of natural diversity. Kirby stated that if there was one thing he had done 'that really helped humanity' it was insisting in Cambodia that HIV/AIDS was a human rights issue: 'That saved lives'. (p. 263). One wonders what the implications are of this. Brown also states that Kirby's interest in genomics had been sharpened by what he saw as evidence that homosexuality was 'almost certainly genetically caused'. He told friends that this meant that it almost certainly had a general biological or societal purpose, waiting to be better understood (p. 276). One guesses Kirby now wants a job in the field and that his legal friends will also now rally round again to help him get it.

Garnaut does not define innovation, in comparison with continuing and improving development of production methods on one hand, or pure research conducted in an academic environment on the other. The former approach seems more likely to be designed to solve a particular practical problem of production or service. This innovation

process ideally also creates a learning culture. Comparatively few Australian employers appear able to undertake or support much scientific and technological research and development on their own behalf. However, across the board benefits may be derived if industry leaders, their organizations and members are willing to participate in broader, more open, regional community planning approaches which also seek more effective communication, skills development, education, and research to achieve national objectives related to control of greenhouse gas emissions and sustainable development generally.

However, most academics who write about innovation are thinking about patents and Garnaut appears the same. The number of patents registered plays a role in determining the supposed quality and prestige of universities, so they are locked into promoting this process which is also driven to serve the richest markets not the greatest human need. As a former academic I have often watched with wonder at the promotional activities of the Sydney University Business Liaison Office, which was supposedly dedicated to assisting academics develop patents. Doing so looked to me like a very poor way of encouraging innovation because it is extremely secretive, highly bureaucratic, expensive, slow, highly uncertain and driven by the interests of the investors in making financial returns, rather than in improving and applying the research which was funded. I often wondered what sort of academics would willingly put themselves through such speculative and stressful financial ordeals. They should be able to speak and practice more openly. Help them.

Thank you for the opportunity to make this submission. Yours truly,
Carol O'Donnell, St James Court, 10/11 Rosebank St., Glebe, Sydney 2037.

FOR HE IS A JUDGE (AND A GOOD JUDGE TOO?) MICHAEL KIRBY

AJ Brown's biography entitled 'Michael Kirby: Paradoxes and Principles' has been the most informative book I've read about Australian legal practice since Marr wrote the biography of Garfield Barwick in 1980. Before Brown's biography I never understood what Kirby believed, what he was trying to do or why. However, Brown is also careful to explain Kirby, rather than to judge any legal practice by any modern scientific and democratic, as distinct from feudal standards of behaviour. No Australian lawyer or related intellectual has been prepared to do this clearly and openly, as far as I am aware.

Michael Kirby spent much of his life denying the existence of his true sexuality and the man he lived with so as to pursue his career. This was related to the apparent desire to legitimate rather than undermine the feudally closed legal institutions in which he has always sought advancement. Kirby became a pawn for governments wishing to show more of the lawyers' powerful, closed, feudal shops without being attacked.

Kirby has joked at professional dinners that he is weak in company law because Murray Gleeson, former president of the NSW Bar, had kept back those university notes, whereas Kirby withheld the constitutional ones. He also wrote privately to Gleeson that he held him personally responsible for the course his life had taken (p. 234). Elsewhere, Kirby argued the unlimited power of politicians was stated in the words 'The Queen in Parliament is Supreme' and suggested that under the NSW Constitution the State

Parliament could abolish the Supreme Court. Later decisions of the High Court would apparently force him to temper this view, which Brown calls 'absolutist' (p. 196).

Brown states that two imperatives underpinned respect for individual privacy: the desire for individuals to have some control over the perceptions which others had of them, and citizens' fears that adverse decisions could be made about them over which they had no control (p. 125). However, effective democracies depend upon the ongoing open analysis and reporting of the rights and duties of increasingly open belief and action. The central point of the Declaration of Human Rights and related national policy directions is to support and assist this more open direction, which religious groups, workers, women, blacks, immigrant and other minorities and individuals have often fought for in Europe, America and around the world as a result of their desire for an improved quality of life.

In Australia we often say we seek democracy but to me we appear blindly and silently chained by fear of lawyers to an irrational, feudal past. Those people who it seems should lead us often appear to me to be the most obsequious and opaque. Who or what exactly are they protecting other than themselves and their closest friends? I urge government and industry to act cooperatively to get rid of pre-scientific approaches, particular when they occupy legal and related financial monopoly positions. Developing plain English education is an excellent preparation for this in my experience. Consider these directions carefully and also the attachments which support this case.

Cheers
Carol O'Donnell, St James Court, Rosebank St., Glebe, Sydney 2037
(Aka Queen of the Monkeys and Lilith the Magic Pudding, Chief Alternative to Faith)