

Dear World Vision

I'M CUTTING OFF MONEY TO BERLENDY AND THE GANG AS HE IS SIXTEEN AND NEEDS A JOB BEFORE WHAT YOU CALL EDUCATION: (IS THIS AN EXAMPLE OF PROVOCATIVE NON-VIOLENCE, DO YOU THINK?)

I reply to your Christmas nativity scene with good wishes and to a drawing of a snowman coloured black from Rodriguez Pinela Berlenty, my sponsored child, aged sixteen. You tell me this kid needs education. I think he needs a job. I worked full-time at his age and studied at night. Let me make a few other things clear, seeing that I have just read Asne Seierstad's international bestseller 'One of Us' about how Anders Behring Breivik killed seventy-seven of his fellow Norwegians in a terrorist atrocity. I can see Breivik's point.

In the many times I have tried to contact your organization and received no response since you dumped South American Berlenti on me without warning, after you presumably ditched the Sri Lankan female I was supporting, I have wondered about your view of appropriate communication. Let me tell you Baby, it isn't the same as mine.

You seem an authoritarian set of people, determined to provide me with a childlike wall telling me what I think and how to respond. I guess Breivik saw something similar. I could put up with this until your levels of childlike notebook communication stepped up. I am retaining Berlenty A's newest Notebook from Dr O'Donnell and lighting it up.

I believe that education without a job is highly unlikely to change my sponsored child's world, although it might change mine if he should turn up on my doorstep. God forbid. I have explained many times to World Vision that I am not a Christian and also why I find the Pope's views on contraception, abortion and family so truly offensive. There are too many poor babies continually being pumped out in debt for the rest to support them. This encourages the development of black economies of many kinds, such as guns, wildlife, drugs, people and rubbish. Berlenty is sixteen. What do you expect about contraception and abortion? Who is he likely to be impregnating soon if he hasn't already? What are you going to do about the results? Ask for more money? Unlike Bing Crosby, I'm not going in your direction. I am out of World Vision and not paying the next instalment.

Breivick hated cultural Marxists, to whom I may belong, as a woman and chimera. Refer him to www.Carolodonnell.com.au I would have killed him, were I in charge, before I read Asne Seierstad's amazingly thoughtful and balanced book. Now I am divided. Why would one kill such a person of interest when he is ideally an international study, like yourselves? (I am a Knights Templar of Marxist Freudian grandmas. Chomsky's grandma and I often worked in teams together. See stuff on some other Jews below.)

The points I mainly seek to get through are that China and Singapore direction in relation to reduced child bearing surely must be followed, as it has also been clearly chosen by European women and their doctors. The alternative market direction seems to be that the welfare direction is inevitably turned into concrete jungles surrounded by spreading and natural resource denuded villages instead. As a grandma I have compared Africa, India and China over time. The policy results are obvious for anyone who really cares to look. As you will not respond to me, although I fund you, it seems you are part of the problem.

Yours remains the pie in the sky so you never die perspective. You appear equally on a population, market and government self-deluded loser to us – the latter being the ones with the higher paid secure jobs where they may also do very little. You could say the same sort of thing to Australian aborigines and much of the Pacific I guess. I'd get more mileage putting my money to work locally some ways I'm exploring. Related options appear below and attached if you could open your mind to considering contraception and abortion as well as jobs like planting trees and vegetation along with building repair or dealing with water, power and resources. **What does Berlendy think about his future?**

Call me old fashioned. However, Like Sydney Lord Mayor Clover Moore, I'm disappointed that despite repeated invitations the current NSW Premier has yet to meet and discuss the future of Sydney and the Planning Minister has yet to meet with the bi-partisan Central Sydney Planning Committee, which facilitates much of the city's building boom and the resulting increased property taxes which have helped to turn around the state budget. In the City of Sydney News (March 2015) the Lord Mayor also said she looked forward to State and Federal governments understanding the significance of our city and our work. Jesus don't a lot of us! Let us randomly poll some of our local Catholics. (I know just the bunch with Sister Mary at the Catholic Society of St Peter. Are Australian country trains the latest and the slowest in the world and does it matter?)

Yet I mainly answered 'Don't Know' to questions in a recent Vote Compass NSW Election 2015 questionnaire. I wasn't given key information at my fingertips to judge. Nevertheless, I turned out in results to be far to the Economic Right of the ALP and LNP but in the top left Green corner voting as a social progressive. I admit it seems personally insightful. Let me make clear here, however, that I couldn't give shit about gay marriage. As a grandma I demand instead the right to a self-chosen, state assisted, easy and useful death as soon as I wish. As a rule I also support the death penalty for mass murderers. The primary point of apparent miscreant treatment for me, is to protect the public from more harm cheaply, as distinct from guessing about a supposed rehabilitation or not of an offender. (I always was a contrarian in not having to worry about any brotherhood first.)

I'd naturally first ask the Chinese about how to deal with all our waste and mounting rubbish except that Japanese, aside from Acts of God, perhaps, appear to have achieved so much success in hiding the latter fast. (Should we have a modest or giant European

camping platz in the middle of the City for all those passing through, seizing public land like Redfern aborigines for themselves alone, or is that just too much of a good thing?)

One notes the Energy Efficiency Master Plan apparently shows how we can reduce City wide emissions to make Sydney one of the most energy efficient cities. I guess a lot of locals would like to know how that is supposed to be done. The plan supports '*building retrofits and tune-ups*'. What is this supposed to mean and how is it supposed to come about? Surely, as Jamie Parker said at our local Town Hall election meeting: 'There is a need for greater expenditure on public housing maintenance to address the \$300 million backlog. The Greens have also called upon the NSW Government to review its existing arrangements with maintenance contractor Spotless. According to the meeting report in the Glebe Grapevine (February 2015), Spotless service delivery has been very poor'. This seems a great opportunity for more open competition as well as broader understanding.

What is it '*to retrofit a property to reduce electricity and water use so as to save more than \$1 million each year*'? Is it mainly fixing pipe and toilet blockages and leaks in related pipes and taps? Do you want to put more solar on roofs and do more solar lighting and heating? What else might be done from the perspective of the Energy Efficiency Master Plan which is apparently is supposed to advance the City's work to build green infrastructure and so cut carbon emissions by 70% at a later stage.

Save our native forests for koalas. Do you like natural light, shade trees and bamboo for building? This is a tough, beautiful, light grass which grows to maturity in five years. Sisal is also beautiful grass. Anyhow, this Energy Efficiency Master Plan is supposedly a key component of the City of Sydney suite of master plans already developed which include **Decentralised Energy** (through renewable energy and trigeneration), **Advanced Waste Treatment** including waste to energy, and **Decentralised Water** including collection and reuse of this precious natural resource. Is there any point asking what this is about? (Words, words, words, I'm so sick of words, etc. What is supposed to go on?)

David Rosen has promised me that his talk entitled 'Can you afford to live where you choose' for the US Studies Centre on 4.3.15 will be openly available. This is discussed later below and we should all see it. Be warned, there are more than the usual fair share of Jews in this proposed direction. – (not Geithner of course.)

Cheers Carol O'Donnell, St James Court, 10/11 Rosebank St., Glebe, Sydney 2037
www.Carolodonnell.com.au

WHAT ON EARTH IS WRONG WITH YOU?

Dear Editor

In an article in the Australian Financial Review (AFR Review 11.9.09, p.1) entitled 'Rethinking economics' Nobel Prize winning US economist, Paul Krugman, argued that 'economists, as a group, mistook beauty, clad in impressive-looking mathematics, for truth'. In spite of all their Nobel Prizes, as a group, they did not see the global economic financial crisis coming. His first suggestion for the future is that economists should face up to the inconvenient reality that financial markets fall far short of perfection and are subject to extraordinary delusions and the madness of crowds. (Too right but worse.)

To make his case he also refers to the national economy going into recession as being like a baby sitting co-operative, where the participants may normally choose not to go out themselves but to try to gain credits instead by baby-sitting other peoples' children. The moral of the story seems to be that too much saving for the future may cause recessions. What a convenient view for Americans. (Are guys like him crazy or just blinkered by the requirements of their career rise? Or did that only happen to Germans before WW2?)

As an Australian, my take on economic matters is different. Firstly, one assumes that by the term 'economists as a group' Krugman is excluding any in China and much of the rest of the world outside the US. One also assumes he is too young to have heard of Karl Marx or the notion that history and politics affect economics and the subjects ought to be studied together. From this perspective one may also assume the economy is more like a military, financial and related property structure than a baby sitting co-operative. and that the latter did not work because nobody wanted to spend the time to manage it properly.

To read Krugman's 'international bestseller' entitled 'The Great Unravelling: The truth about crony capitalism from the man who can prove it' is to wonder who is pulling whose leg. Australians have been saying this kind of thing at the pub since I was a girl, only more clearly and without the aid of degrees or Nobel Prizes. (Please don't think me rude.)

Knowing how strongly interested in psychology US economists and their friends are now becoming in order to fix the terrible problems of economics, one naturally wants to help the psychoanalytic approach. One therefore remembers Randy Newman's album 'Sail Away' from 1972. In 'Political Science' he discusses the American psyche and its relationships with others. Part of it is below. We play it upside down and backwards. We would be grateful for assistance on related policy, like economics. See it at the end.

Yours truly, Carol O'Donnell, St James Court, 10/11 Rosebank St., Glebe, Sydney 2037
www.Carolodonnell.com.au

Political Science from the album Sail Away (Newman 1972)

No-one likes us, I don't know why,

We may not be perfect, but heaven knows we try
And all around, even our old friends put us down
Let's drop the big one, and see what happens.
We give them money, but are they grateful?
First they're spiteful; then they're hateful
They don't respect us, so let's surprise them
We'll drop the big one and pulverize them

We'll save Australia; don't wanna hurt the kangaroo
We'll build an all-American amusement park there
They've got surfing too.
Boom goes London! Boom Paree!
More room for you and more room for me
And every city, the whole world round, will just be another American town
Oh how peaceful it will be; we'll set everybody free
You'll have a Japanese kimono, Baby, Italian shoes for me
They all hate us anyhow, so let's drop the big one now!

Hi

I greatly enjoyed David Rosen's talk entitled 'Can you afford to live where you choose' for the US Studies Centre on 4.3.15. It was highly unusual to feel overwhelmed with practical information as distinct from comparatively removed and theoretical direction on the topic.

David Rosen certainly appears to know his US housing affordability onions and I only wish that I had had the sense to take a pen and paper with me to make notes.

Today I have been looking for copies of his talk or slides for quite a long time but although I find references to this performance on a number of Sydney Uni. websites I cannot find either.

I recall Dr Rosen said we could get copies of his talk or something like it from you. I would be very grateful for anything you might email or otherwise direct me to, so that I can study what he said last night, or something like it, again at my leisure. I was particularly interested in his references to financial treatments of church land in Manhattan and land in Florida (?).

From memory and the depths of my practical ignorance, I thought that in linking definitions of affordable housing to the median income and housing price in states, to provide finance accordingly, Dr Rosen was also describing key US housing causes of the global financial crisis in 2008 and of increasing US inequality, rather than the reverse. He mainly appeared, however, to be talking about comparative state systems and taxes, rather than related federal issues Timothy Geithner discusses in 'Stress Test: Reflections on Financial Crises'(2014).

For example, Geithner says:

‘We all knew lax lending standards were helping families buy more expensive homes with less money down. Other families were staying put, then using their existing homes as ATMs by borrowing against their soaring home values (p.110). The financial system could easily absorb the \$30 billion collapse of IndyMac. There was no way it could absorb the collapse of Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac. The two government sponsored enterprises held or guaranteed more than \$5 trillion in mortgage debt. They were funding about three out of every four new US mortgages.....I had been wary of Fannie and Freddie ever since I had watched the Clinton Treasury and Greenspan try without success to rein in their leverage..... Closely entwined with the government since birth, they were the most dangerous example of moral hazard in the financial system’(p. 169).
.....etc. etc.

I would very much like to learn more from Dr Rosen and attach recent submissions to government inquiries for info. See related direction at www.Carolodonnell.com.au I’d be grateful for anything further you can send or direct me to regarding Dr Rosen’s talk.

Yours truly

Carol O’Donnell, St James Court, 10/11 Rosebank St., Glebe, Sydney 2037