

Dear Deputy PM and Others

**MARXIST FEMINISTS MAY SEEK DEATH THROUGH FREER MARKETS:
AND THAT'S A FACT, JACK!**

I am an elderly Marxist feminist who gratefully feels she now owes her body to medical science and seeks a freer market to enable the ultimate donation. Also help me and others to serve more vulnerable stakeholders, including any other more endangered individuals or species. My related aim is to assist the Prime Minister (PM) and NSW governments to collectively mend all rifts, so the former may meet his Election Promise Scoresheet in a timely manner. In seeking cooperation to achieve all the above, this letter is naturally open to any others. According to the Sydney Morning Herald article entitled 'Sure footed with a change of tempo' (SMH 22-23/11/08, p. 28), the PM lags on implementing high speed broadband for schools and also on the national broadband network, among his other commitments. He may now achieve these promises by leading development in New South Wales, which contains the Constitutional Mother Parliament.

I am glad the PM has not implemented his promise of legal action against the President of Iran for alleged anti-Semitism. The suggestion appears only one step up from Mr McCain's desire to bomb Iran. Did it emanate from Mr Bush or Ahmadinejad? Any sensible person who has seen Canberra or Milton-Keynes should not trust a town planner, and my understanding is that the current President of Iran was one. It is hard enough to define a Semite without also judging what constitutes his opposition, comparatively speaking. Does one ignore the women or go cross-gender? The latter would seem stupid. The PM should instead read Akbar Ganji's informative discussion of power in Iran, entitled 'The latter-day sultan', in the Australian Financial Review 21.11.08, Review 5, and try to start broader communications to achieve more common goals. Otherwise we will never get rid of the feuding lawyers' mafias. They just live richly on their proceeds and encourage toadies. If we are all soon to be prosecuted for being anti-American, then who escapes whipping? Healthier, freer, broader development is better.

In the above context I therefore draw your attention to the fact that the Australian Organ and Tissue Donation and Transplantation Authority Act will commence on 1st January 2009. I also refer to my previous queries to you about the current and ideal principles of child care and greenhouse gas auditing, as well as to more recent attached discussions on home and community care provision, hosted by the Institute of Public Affairs of Australia (IPAA). My general aims in life are to gain greater public recognition of the need for more competitive, greener development everywhere, and to obtain more personal choice for elderly citizens, so as to render more support to other more vulnerable beings. This route is also necessary for freer international markets and attaining Millennium Development goals. Once doctors may have sacrificed a mother to save her baby. All Australians now have many broader options and freer markets than they did before. (Fighting for this freedom ultimately makes life worthwhile? You be the judge.)

As a traditional Australian Marxist and feminist, I think a better way forward for Australia and Iran is to collaborate regionally to assist more diverse communication in

order to achieve healthier and more sustainable development locally and globally. I therefore suggest multiple processes of community consultation to the PM, on the related assumption that broadly linking financial planning and religious faith can usually promote more positive community consensus in any regional service design and delivery context. The position I present is consistent with that of outgoing president Bush, as expressed on ABC TV. He supports 'Free markets, free trade, and free people' and I do too. As another former US president, Bill Clinton, also famously observed, 'It's the economy, Stupid'. For excellent reasons we all now appear to be heartily sick of all the Christians who have been dictating to the rest of us for centuries. I offer a way out in which the Australian Organ and Tissue Donation and Transplantation Authority Act (AOTDTAA(?)) and all other services are ideally addressed in a freer trading context where nobody need ever be rude or feel insulted ever again, unless they choose it.

Many poor women have little or no choice whether they carry a child or not. That choice is largely up to men and they too, may have no contraception. Uncontrolled population growth is therefore a major problem for all those seeking to end poverty and to improve health and sustainable development by freer choice. The use of nuclear power remains a key safety concern for every nation, particularly in Iran. The record on Iranian women and children's health, family planning and related education are all comparatively good for a developing nation. Ideally, Australians should try to collaborate further with Iranians or with other willing communities in order to improve child and community health further, including through nuclear medicine and environment protection services. This alternative direction is better than fighting, at huge and continuing legal expense, over who may or may not be an anti-Semite. Sticks and stones may break my bones, etc.

Achieving Millennium Development and related goals requires healthier, freer trade. Since perfect markets require perfect information, the broadest possible communication is logically the best way forward to the freest markets. I therefore assume that talks about how to do it should start with Sol Trujillo who heads Telstra and with related others, including ABC and SBS TV, other TV stations, newspapers, Microsoft, Google, Sony, libraries, etc. The Telstra slogan, 'Spread the Good Stuff' is helpful – too bad about the package. We will decide what is good. There are related axes to grind with Christians, which is also the reason I draw your attention to the forthcoming Australian Organ and Tissue Donation and Transplantation Authority Act (the acronym is impossible!) and their refusal to allow those of us who are elderly and who wish to plan our deaths to do it.

The problem of Christians is discussed later. I first recommend the attached faux-Christian financial crisis consultation and service planning direction, which employs a 'What Would Jesus Do?' methodology, however imperfectly. This consultation model may be adapted to meet diverse requirements within any religion or culture, which also seek to promote good health, sustainable development and freer choice. The model begins with the assumption that Jesus loved the little children of the world, whatever their colour, and also valued all things bright and beautiful, all creatures, great and small and all things wise and wonderful most highly, because he thought his Father made them all. From a Marxist feminist perspective, such Christian principles appear consistent for co-operative planning purposes, with the UN Declaration of Human Rights and related

sustainable development requirements. Ideally, they also serve the health goals through greenhouse gas reduction, the protection of biodiversity, maintenance of heritage values, education and similar goods or services which may often be valued highly, from anybody's cultural or religious view. More openly scientific approaches to managing risk are ideally constructed to meet more commonly identified goals and values shared across many cultural or religious communities – which may be very big or very small. (Then find us some good project managers and clearly related accountants!)

I now turn to the Christians. If every Australian over retirement age who wished to do so was given the choice to end their life up to two years earlier than might otherwise be so, the taxpayers could save vast amounts of money on care towards the end of life, when its quality may also be diminished and so valued least by some of us. When we are old enough to rationally assume that we will not get better, some of us may wish that the money which keeps us alive was spent instead on making life more comfortable for many who apparently have much more reason to live than we do ourselves, such as all those who are younger and more vulnerable. From such a Marxist, feminist moral perspective, voluntary organ donation in old age may be conceived as a great form of public service, a related potential gesture of personal gratitude or atonement and a choice ideally made available in the public interest to anybody who is elderly. I aspire to make this choice, albeit preferably at some stage later on. I have always tried to make the most of my body and I am deeply grateful for its absolutely outstanding service. I would ideally like it to help others live, including monkeys and other endangered species. I feel I owe my substantial quality of life to medical scientists. Kill me for them when I want to go.

However, it appears impossible to have sustainable development or free markets while Christians are still pushing the rest of us around. Statistics suggest that many old men are currently trying to achieve the personal choice of death and that failing may commonly also be their fate. For example, my elder brother, a former US space program engineer, developed Parkinson's disease. Being an American citizen he owned some guns and shot himself. He died after weeks in hospital, and the family got the bill. He was not the only elderly, sick member of my family to try to end his life unsuccessfully. I do not have such courage and am angry that as an old Australian woman who hates guns and is risk averse, I do not have the right to plan my death the way I want it. The most likely method of my death currently appears to entail being scraped out of the couch after a week of being dead in front of TV. I might also die and fall on my computer, although the newspaper would probably be better. I hate funerals and no-one except my daughter would come. I find all this undignified but am more worried that mobile phone calls would destroy my excellent quality of life and intensely related spiritual communication. (Basically, I'm still healthy, but have come across a few drooling providers seeking to make my life better through preventative medicine. Who could blame them for trying?)

The truth is often unattractive for anybody, including Christians. For example, I made email observations about death similar to the above to colleagues, when I was teaching about Australian health policy and service delivery in the Faculty of Health Sciences at Sydney University. At lightning speed I was accused of being depressed, which I denied. The head of department, a professor of psychology, invited me to see a psychiatrist,

because he said he remained concerned about my mental health. As I had never seen one before, I readily agreed to any new experience, which he fixed for as early as possible - three months later. The psychiatrist did not believe I was not depressed. Specifically following the concerns of the professor of psychology, he suggested a battery of tests to determine my underlying pathology and to provide base-line information prior to a repeat consultation with him. He also sought thus to monitor any further deterioration of my mental state, presumably also in the eyes of colleagues. My employer would bear the cost of this under workers compensation legislation. I refused all further tests because although I am one who often enjoys discussion with new people, I also object if they start sticking things in my body. I consent to such intrusions only if feeling very safe. Actually, I felt bullied by closet Christians and professionals posing as concerned about their patients, while employers or taxpayers are forced to pay for their pretence. (It's publish and make professor or perish around here. Baby, I can certainly understand it!)

There is a lesson for government in the apparently individual experience above, because I guess that many more vulnerable people feel put through something much worse at regular intervals. My dislike of control goes back to my father and being a girl. At nineteen I went to a Queensland doctor for the contraceptive pill. He gave me a lecture about avoiding sex before marriage and the bill instead. A year later I married a civil engineer. It was over after three years and I never attempted it since. I blame many of my current views on Christians and also on Nigeria, but that is another story. I return to my major concern, which is for Australians and all others to be able to pursue communication and all related trade more freely, to obtain sustainable development. This necessarily starts with more widely available child health and family planning services, but also with wider choices under the Australian Organ and Tissue Donation and Transplantation Authority Act. The act has great potential for assisting trade and sustainable development through first enabling freer choice. (My adult Australian sensibilities owe more to a youthful taste for Broadway musicals and Marxist teachings than to Australian Christians or to lawyers. Nevertheless, I can recognize a winner.)

All those who seek to propose and justify a wider choice of goods or services in the public interest should ideally be accommodated. I definitely come into that category. Specifically, I want to plan my death and donate my body to medical scientists, doctors or their patients, just before a Registered Killer takes me, but this is definitely not a sign of continuing grief. Perhaps Charlton Heston first subconsciously made me recognize the useful role that an Australian version of a Registered Killer might play in promoting individual, community or other species health and all related trade. In the movie, 'Soylent Green', a corporation secretly turns dead people into food for all living on an overcrowded, violent and denuded Earth. This brilliant movie got the future wrong. It lacked an understanding of the coming feminist, consumer and related technological revolutions and the freer markets they forced upon us all. The continuing policy and service development direction that I propose now involves elderly people being given greater personal choice over the timing of their own death, in order to help raise money for healthier, greener development for all. Church is no longer the ideal female refuge from involuntary breeding and violent destruction by men whose lives are also stripped of almost all other pleasures at the hands of brotherhood mafias. Get off our old backs!

The establishment of the position of Registered Killer, to assist the work of the Australian Organ and Tissue Donation and Transplantation Authority, that I accordingly propose, would offer greater personal choice to many elderly people who must also die comparatively soon. For example, I would very much enjoy knowing that besides making my useful organs available to others, any financial proceeds from my body parts might also be dedicated towards supporting endangered mammals, such as orang utans and pandas, or other beings. I would be thrilled, for example, if any of my left over body bits could be used instead of krill, to feed fingerlings safely. My daughter can have the house and any other money my fund managers might achieve through better investments. I attach related financial advice on housing, carbon pollution reduction and sustainable development that I have sent to my UniSuper fund managers and others. The former are a hopeless bunch of losers. I have never lost so much of my money in my entire life.

A Catholic medical ethicist recently pointed out to me that being a Registered Killer, could only present inappropriate role confusion for doctors of any stripe. On the other hand, allied professionals such as dentists could surely administer some killer anaesthetic to the elderly folk who ask for it, without any role confusion. For example, my dentist is at Broadway, close to Sydney University and home. He is Australian Chinese with medical specialists in the family. On a recent visit I therefore asked him to consider the financial possibilities of pursuing such accreditation. I believe that all old people, such as me, have a perfect right to try to do as much good to others before death as possible, while also maximising financial outcomes to help future generations. Is it only Christians who appear to want to stop those who wish to do it from acting to achieve these ends?

Christian or related legal prohibitions against the death penalty for major criminals must also be understood as occurring in many contexts where the urban or rural poor and disabled are given no government economic support of any kind whatever. From any perspective, but especially from theirs, the jails may appear most accurately conceptualised as comparatively expensive forms of welfare service provision, made primarily to those who appear least deserving. The funds might logically have been spent more usefully elsewhere, including on provision of relevant contraceptive devices to reduce poverty, crime and all related environmental degradation. We need more useful dialogue with Christians so that everybody can have their personal wishes satisfied better.

I'd be grateful for any support or further direction from anyone about these matters. In the interests of future conflict reduction, please also note that the next time a Catholic doctor and ethicist with Powerpoint slides and a baby on her hip feels free to tell me exactly how I must die with dignity, I may feel like shoving her teeth down her throat so far she can only sip soup for a week. Nobody need ever advise me when I am genuinely in love either, rather than being self-deluded. As the Premier also recently said about being in love or traffic, 'I'll be the judge of that'. He may well have also been thinking of Cardinal Pell. Who do these Catholics ideologues and their mafias think they really are? The bastards appear much like cockroaches. No matter how old I get they never give up. The current Pope seems relatively good, especially given the trend of centuries.

The further away from the Origins the better was normally Marx's experience. I'm still with him because he's still the best. However, what else have you got to offer? (I never forget my Marx or Freud and Dylan.)

This letter and its supporting correspondence and submissions are therefore offered for consideration by the PM, through you or anybody else, in order that he may complete his Election Promise Scoresheet as effectively as possible, and also in a timely manner.

Yours truly, Carol O'Donnell, St James Court.

SO WHAT IS SEXUAL HARASSMENT? RESPONSE TO THE SEXUAL HARASSMENT OFFICER

So what is sexual harassment? In Honi Soit (30.4.08, p.10) the Sexual Harassment Officer of the Student Representative Council of Sydney University says:

Sexual harassment is taking advantage of a situation where women cannot or will not say no (women are socialised not to speak up when we are bothered).

I reply: How does a stupid man know when a woman cannot or will not say no, unless the woman tells him clearly first?

It is wrong if women are socialised not to speak up, because this means they are unable to take responsibility for themselves, let alone for others who are even weaker. Women who find themselves socialised not to speak up should learn to change their behaviour, so that others who are often in their care (e.g. children, doctors' patients, clients, the frail elderly, disabled people, animals, prisoners, workers in dangerous jobs, the general public etc. etc.) may be protected from more powerful others who could wrong them with impunity, unless a woman close by speaks out clearly about her beliefs, with evidence of likely wrongdoing, in her opinion. Then ideally all may learn from any ensuing debate.

Ms Dingley says:

Sexual harassment is assuming your sexual advances are always desired (when the majority of the time they are not.) Sexual harassment is denying a woman the right to choose.

I reply: In Ms Dingley's world it seems a woman never has a right to choose sex, because she is ideally never offered it. She is also not expected to grasp it for herself.

I would guess that very few people are confident enough to think that their sexual advances are always desired. One wonders why Ms Dingley thinks this is the male norm. It certainly is not my experience. Should nobody ever make the first speech or gesture of desire in her world? It logically seems so. If people are never allowed to voice their desires, what does Ms Dingley suggest they do with them instead? I hate her world in

which it seems I have no right to approach or be approached with desire. Pleasure and/or learning often spring from the desire for greater intimacy in my experience.

In Ms Dingley's world, nobody has a right to choose because nobody is allowed to express themselves honestly about emotion. They are instead invited to guess and adjust to the views of others with whom they come into contact, without ever actually knowing what those views are. This is the authoritarian, ignorant, polite, lying, boring world of easily frightened, constantly anxious and therefore intensely limited people. I know it well and I loathe it. Get over it for Christ's sake! Everybody will thank you for it.

Or is Ms Dingley pulling our leg? Warning friends to respect one's privacy and not look at one's porn seems a particularly provocative act to me. It seems exactly like an invitation. (I am obviously a Freudian.) I have had a number of different guests at my place in the last few years. It never crossed my mind to warn any of them not to look for my vibrators, etc. while I was out. (I say nothing of their level of personal attraction.)

God knows what Ms Dingley thinks she's supposed to be doing as the Sydney University Student Representative Council Sexual Harassment Officer. What does the position involve? How did she get it? Who does she report to? How does her work relate to broader Sydney University management and legal responsibilities to academic colleagues, employees, students and their surrounding communities? Does she have any expected relationship with the National Tertiary Education Union? These are not idle questions. I expect notice and a quick response. You should publish this in Honi Soit.

Please also see the attached proposal for a national re-education program which I have recently made to the National Health and Hospitals Reform Commission and others. (Jesus knows you all need it. In my view the staff and lawyers are the major problem.)

Yours truly
Carol O'Donnell