

Hi

I wanted to draw the matters below and attached to the attention of the 7.30 report on ABC TV after Leigh Sales requested ideas for stories on 25.6.2020. I can't get the views on Julia Gillard, policy and lawyers outlined below and attached through the ABC system.

ON JULIA GILLARD, SILENCE, AND THE MORAL AND INTELLECTUAL DUTY TO SPEAK OUT ABOUT WHAT SEEMS TRUE

Professor Shamit Saggat, director of the University of Western Australia Public Policy Institute in Perth praises former PM Julia Gillard in an Australian Financial Review article entitled '*Gillard's blow for women her great legacy*' (AFR, 25.6.20, p.43). The professor states Gillard had to contend with a political culture in Canberra which turned a blind eye to the disgraceful treatment of senior women in public life. Should we assume Shamit Saggat couldn't give a shit about junior women beside her mates as usual? I guess so.

The Professor admires Gillard for showing women can get to be PM, to fight in public with Tony Abbott along Party lines about misogyny to her. The professor also assumes that Julia Gillard is to be applauded for not speaking up to justify her actions in the political coup that deposed Kevin Rudd as PM, roughly ten years earlier. Shamit Saggat is wrong in applauding a secret coup which Gillard went along with against a PM who seemed much brighter than her, as well as elected by the Australian people. She is also wrong in believing Gillard never has to explain or justify her behaviour again to anybody, after Labor lost the election.

The reverse is the case from more moral and effectively democratic management perspectives. Gillard's actions in this coup soured my view of the Labor Party irreparably, after many years of my being a rusted on Labor voter. Anything she has got to say to justify her actions I want to hear, especially if she feels sorry for what she and the Labor brothers did behind closed doors. As voters, we can learn how to be better contributors to more broadly informed and democratic management only through more broadly reasoned information and judgment, particularly about powerful figures. The comparatively poor have been studied forever. The torchlights should be turned back on the powerful faces of those who hide behind them in the name of feudally constructed legal behaviour.

The Hon. Michael Kirby, AC, CMG praised Mary Gaudron as a bright star of the Australian legal firmament because of her role as the first woman Justice of the High Court. If you read From **Moree to Mabo**, the Mary Gaudron story, however, you will see, that her life was tragic and much of that horror sprang from what Labor men who were jealous of her position and money did to her. She had a sad and terrible life as a Catholic woman elevated in a jealous male Labor fold. You wouldn't have wanted it. I feel less sorry for Julia Gillard.

When I was young, for example, every great man had a shorthand-typist. Today he has a lawyer who can type with two fingers instead. Is this progress? I don't think so because the

law is a nasty, ignorant, feudally confused beast, like Shamit Saggar. I bet she has lawyers in her family, extended or not. It is disappointing to find a comparatively rich, dumb, woman like her running a public policy unit in a university, even if she has a brownish vagina. Julia Baird seems infinitely smarter but I accused her of similar errors in her last public letter to her daughter in the Sydney Good Weekend. Read my forthcoming book **Power Loving** instead. Related information about avoiding lawyers and other difficult matters is attached. A related request I have sent to my local member with notice to others is below.

Cheers

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

Hi Anna, Daniel, Penny, et al.

I SEE BY YOUR OUTFIT THAT YOU ARE A COWBOY: CAN YOU HELP ME FIND NIXON APPLE? (I'VE ALREADY FOUND ROD AFTER SEARCHING FOR YEARS)

SEE RELATED DISCUSSION WITH TANYA PLIBERSEK BELOW AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION ATTACHED

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

Dear Tanya

READING MY AUTOBIOGRAPHY 'POWER LOVING', AND FINDING THE RECIPIENT OF QUEEN'S BIRTHDAY HONOURS (2019) FOR SERVICES TO TRADE UNIONS AND SUPERANNUATION (WILLIAM NIXON APPLE)

I have been a local constituent of yours for many years and am writing to you in this capacity, in regard to your historic and longstanding roles in Australian Labor government, as the Member for Sydney.

During the 2020 coronavirus pandemic I wrote my autobiography entitled **Power Loving** and sent it off to a handful of publishers in June 2020. Synopses and a first copy are attached. I have had no replies from publishers as yet.

I would be very grateful if you or anybody in your office or network would be interested in reading or commenting on **Power Loving** for personal interest, my book revision or promotional purposes. **Thank you very much for considering this.**

A related question I have is whether your office has contact or can make contact with William Nixon Apple, the recipient of Queen's Birthday Honours (2019) for services to Trade Unions and Superannuation. **Do you know how he might be best contacted?**

I spent over ten years in an intimate relationship with Nixon before he left Sydney to go to Melbourne to continue his work with relevant unions and the ACTU. I want to find him to get his comment on **Power Loving**, because I would not want to portray him or his work wrongly. However, he remarried Marion Gaynor from the ACTU in Melbourne in the mid-1990s and has not responded to any attempts I have made to get in touch with him since, including through offices of the Commonwealth Governor General, after his award in 2019.

I would be very grateful for any interest you take in **Power Loving**, including any help or advice you or others in your office can give me in finding Nixon and asking for his comment, ideally so that I may correct and revise my work in the light of both, before publication.

The intended audience of **Power Loving** is lovers or students of autobiography; biography; history; education, health care, women and children's affairs; current affairs and government or other management and administration. LAW in fact. However, **Power Loving** is more like everything you didn't want to know about sex and the professions from a former teacher, rather than a typical 'Me Too' response.

I would be very grateful for any help or advice you or your office can provide in both or either of these controversial matters as I would not like my work to attract lawyers because of being undercooked. I can be contacted at cfodonnell@gmail.com or on 0498777665.

Thank you very much for any reply and hoping very much for a positive one. **Power Loving** is attached and there is more about my life and work at www.Carolodonnell.com.au

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

Hi Jefferson (also to related others).

IT'S TIME TO TELL THE TRUTH FREE EVENT RUN BY AMNESTY ON ZOOM (22.6.2020)

I can't use Zoom and prefer writing anyway because it leaves a truer record of what I think now. I might change my mind in future and state why, but I don't think it's likely.

I am therefore **writing this email** about the Amnesty event **IT'S TIME TO TELL THE TRUTH**. **I hope you will pass this on to Amnesty**. This is why I hate their lawyers' guts. I have a related suggestion first about housing design to benefit the bottom fifty percent of building occupants, rather than the fifty percent of building owners and renters starting at the top.

I don't just hate lawyers. I hate all the other bastards following them who promise equilibrium and deliver chaos and corruption instead. This is increasingly done through fraudulent secret forms of IT related practice which seldom deliver properly to clients. These may start with Amazon as well as with banks, as Adele Ferguson has already noted.

As a first contracting or exchange principle, for example:

I would never make any agreement about service or money as a result of an incoming phone call. Speech is comparatively dumb if it leaves no open written record so that history can be more easily and broadly known and reflected on more accurately than memory allows. The constant incoming unwelcome phone call is a reason I hate mobile phones. Claudia Valentine, who recounts how she was fleeced by this in the Weekend Sydney Morning Herald, appears unbelievably stupid

for a woman who is supposed to be a crime writer. How does she do it? James? The lawyer, however, never points out the bleeding obvious, because it would spoil their trade and all the related careers advance higher up the chain than you and your pathetic whingers. Follow me in attacking lawyers instead.

This is the necessary context in which I address housing construction for the bottom 50% of the population, rather than the top. I do this in a related local context where our beloved Sydney Lord Mayor, Clover Moore and some of the less dopey members of her entourage, are actually committed to social mix in housing in general, and also to social housing. Private sector strata plan and building managers should work better, more openly and cheaply, with the City of Sydney and others. Avoid all lawyers like the plague and write better yourself. Let your mother or uncle have a go if you are too frightened to write. One naturally aims to speak or write, as always, in the regional interest, which is international.

I end my recommendation today with the particular example of the current Blackwattle Bay plan for massive concrete overbuilding rather than parks and gardens and public transport. In this context ***my major recommendation is for heavily expanded and continuous parks and gardens in urban environments, such as ours. There should also be heavily reduced floor to ceiling ratios in all new buildings approved in the City of Sydney, with a related regional social mix, including social housing and more public transport.*** It should be even better than Harold Park development which seemed good as a model on public land. All land for which an owner cannot easily be found should be considered public, to avoid all related risk.

Open the fucking lot up and reduce it to provide more parks, gardens and public transport. Save a lot of money by getting rid of a lot of mystifying feudal drivel typical of lawyers. Speak and write to each other openly and manage money properly, for example. Building floor and ceiling ratios should generally be smaller for better designed construction rather than sized for the big family groupings of the past, albeit with fewer or no children now.

Let me tell you more of what I think, and why I hate Amnesty and lawyers in general.

Firstly, they gee people up into always going for more money as a form of compensation, instead of ever taking responsibility for working out broader community management principles and forms more sensible than the constant, infantile, whinging and bleating for more from a welfare state typically funded by others. This total welfare state exists in few countries in the world to the extent that it does in Australia. It is forever in danger of being destroyed by feudal legal roots and alliances. These ruling feudal forces appear principally dedicated to promoting more community violence in the name of community protection.

For example, take the Australian Constitution first. It assumes Australia rightly first ignores the existence of any original inhabitants before whites landed. Then its supposedly supporting law, supposedly protects a supposedly dying aboriginal race. Today, however, this designated 'race' is actually comparatively flourishing in purely reproductive terms. As a white Northern European I am now from a dying race. This is also partly why our women and kids are comparatively rich. The fewer kids we have the more is left for the rest. See?

Australian government has primary identifications first with British and later US feudal institutions. The US Constitution, for example, elevates the trade in guns above all other forms of

trade. This elevated trade in violent response is encouraged, openly or secretly, across the world in the name of family and community 'protection' or 'defence'. The man with the gun is accorded a naturally privileged position enshrined in law above the rest he kills, because of his fear or hate, whether he is white, black or of a yellow or brownish tinge.

Australian forces were first part of British and then US feudal lackey states, and thus the vile murdering associates of those who have repeatedly bombed, killed and maimed more peaceful others on all feudal sides, throughout the 20th Century. In my experience, however, Amnesty has never pointed this out, preferring to abuse China. This is one of many reasons why I hate their organization and think its primary aim is self-perpetuating. Personally, I wish they would all drop dead. (Just kidding.)

Some people might think 230 years is a long time to live a lie, but as a totally white woman I am now part of a dying race that has been living the feudal lie which starts with lawyers (clerks of God and the Monarch) far longer. As a Marxist grandma, therefore, let me first tell you why I have hated Amnesty since the day it was drawn to my attention. Probably because they are lawyers, they never offer disinterested global community advice on what any regional management authority should **DO**. For example, what does Amnesty think is the appropriate behaviour when people either **will not, or cannot, pay fines**, for good or bad reasons? Why does Amnesty appear to confine itself largely to speech bashing up cops? How helpful is that? **Why not say what you think they should do**, as any good wife or handmaiden might say to her disgusting, hiding, lying and violently fornicating relative?

The rule of law is an institutionalised feudal practice thriving on secrecy, lies and confusion. Don't waste your money on lawyers first. Sit down and write your opinions on what should be done in your case, or in others, from a perspective of the public interest in good order.

In short, if Amnesty or any other group hate something, I think they should:

- 1. State why they hate it in the context of the joint international and regional interest in inclusive fairness and peace**
- 2. State how they think any apparent conflict could be fixed in the more democratic and scientific public interest than the feudal one**, as distinct from according to the particular prescriptions of blinkered, partial and proliferating feudal law designs.

Lawyers are beasts of institutionalized feudal conflict who will naturally refuse to give up their positions of power under Australian and US Constitutions. They ignore or cannot handle the real interests of people living in peace, rather than those gearing up for war and expansion into other land and building as usual later. Gearing up for war is comparatively easy to do, using the money of comparatively open and peaceful people at best, and destroying their lives at worst. Global historical study shows this. Top military and related commercial states are huge, predate all others, and so easily lap up any related funds. Baby, when the boys call for more jobs. It's where they nearly always can get them. Katy Perry and I want more singing and dancing in the ranks.

CLOSING THE GAP (I ASK LAWYERS AND ABORIGINES)

How is it possible to reduce inequality between aboriginal people (however defined) and others, if the highest rates of human reproduction occur in rural and remote areas? This is also where there is comparatively little industry and few paid jobs. What do you expect them to do except end up in jail? Why not face the facts of life and death for once? I suggest programs related to the care of native land and water, where human resources to do the work, should be paid or unpaid, often as matters of choice. (Gays might think of marriage because making that free choice of paid work or not is what heterosexual women do all the time. It is normally women working freely. I suggest old rich men be forced to choose if they will work freely, or whether their wives and kids should go begging as usual.

Australian women who have availed themselves of contraception and abortion more effectively than others, naturally also appear richer financially. Others may move in some well-connected top family circles already, in international and local terms. In those top international circles of rich families and kids, they look after each other with particularly expensive schools and universities that may be hindrances to broader public welfare lower down the top defining career chains, buttressed by their broader richer freer family connections. Chinese people did not fight wars and have a revolution so as to see feudal lawyers drive everything back to help rich kids in the next generation. Help us all open up in the related international, regional, local and individual interest. **Piss off all the lawyers.**

To close the gap and improve the status of women and children, contraception and abortion must be facilitated and encouraged, rather than the reverse. This is particularly the case in law abiding communities where the welfare of the community is brought low by serial pregnancies which may principally appear related to adult incapacity to cope in orderly life.

I hate Amnesty and those who hang off this obnoxious organisation. They abused China for the true observation by Chinese people and government that without population reduction rather than increase, the further impoverishment of Chinese people would result. Impoverishment related to comparatively unsustainable population increase has occurred in most African rural and urban states, for obvious comparative example. Why avoid this bleeding obvious policy fact and attack China? The lawyer is a naturally feudal beast most concerned about their related proliferation of continuing control over human affairs.

I SUPPORT ORGAN HARVESTING AND DEATH SERVICES ON THE GROUNDS OF COMPARATIVELY WELL-INFORMED PERSONAL CHOICE

For general population health and wellbeing, I believe organ harvesting should occur and be more encouraged in more broadly and effectively administered conditions, which naturally must be more globally open. In this context I support the right of old people, such as myself, to choose a particular time of death, and to be supported by state death services. In the current international and national contexts, **I greatly fear the development of a medico-legal state which tries to keep me alive for as long as possible, even against my own will**, for medical and IT experiments and for related professional career and financial advance.

Feudal relations regularly send men to war and bomb peace loving people. Men who join armies are allowed to volunteer for comparatively early death. Men are encouraged to undertake sports and occupations which kill and injure regularly in large numbers. Old women like me, on the other hand, who may wish to die, get no help from the feudal state. It is hard for me to tell you how much I

despise the lying hypocrisy of lawyers who I know understand the situation people are in, but who refuse to ever speak the obvious truth.

I SUPPORT DEATH FOR MASS MURDERERS WHOSE IDENTITY IS CERTAIN

I've always hated Amnesty for its resistance to death penalties for any criminals, no matter how vicious their crimes against peaceful life or how certain the identity of the killer is.

Why should such people be kept in jail on any public purse? This is especially the case in countries with no welfare state except the family. The Amnesty position supports the right to life of the certain mass murderer before all others they may continue to oppress from the comparative security of jail. The Amnesty position seeks a welfare state first for some of the most dysfunctional and violent members of any society. It ignores those in the society that violent others impoverish and disable. They are thrown back upon their own family resources rather than living on the public purse which supports the certain murderers first.

WHEN A LAWYER OR ABORIGINE, ETC. IS ON TV TO DISCUSS POLICE OR OTHER FORCES, THEY SHOULD GIVE CLEAR INDICATIONS WHAT BEHAVIOUR THEY CONSIDER WOULD MEET THE PUBLIC INTEREST IN COMPARATIVELY ORDERLY AND FAIR LIFE, TO BE LIVED WITHOUT CREATING INCREASINGLY VIOLENT TROUBLE FOR RELATED COMMUNITIES

I speak as a former teacher who knows how well an unruly child can easily destroy the work and application to self and community improvement of all other children in the class. What should we poor teachers do when faced with such challenging behaviour?

Boys used to be sent to the office for the strap. Then they were sent to the psychologist, followed by the psychiatrist, to be put on legal drugs for long terms at the public expense. This is the current case, where the diagnosis and drugging of children is increasingly normalized at public expense. I think drugging people is a collective avoidance mechanism which produces harm and cost proliferation and which is led by the medico-legal state.

What would the lawyers suggest to teachers, parents, police, prison officers and others apparently unable to deal well with more unruly behaviours? More of the same but at higher doses until the symptoms stop? Don't hold your breath? As a former teacher, I don't see speech as comparatively unruly. I see speech as a window on the personal soul seeking direction, like me with lawyers and aborigines, etc. etc. etc. What in the fuck would you or Amnesty expect to see done if you wanted better behaviour from anyone in future?

WHAT THE FUCK DO YOU WANT US TO DO BESIDES END UP IN CHAOS?

I know that lawyers drive the directions in all this, but in my book, they are gutless feudal filth and rotten lackeys of US war and violence, preying with their mates on the rest of us. Their humanities education in regional history, of which law is part, is ignored by lawyers, in favour of the rule of law over others, which is feudally applied.

Law practice is institutionalized conflict in a total communications environment controlled by lawyers acting together in secret, as if they represent a God or Monarch, choosing wisely for the nation, without seeing or treating their own outrageous and unnecessary demands for more money,

status and related job practice. Lawyers have the educational wherewithal to point out the more obvious ways out of many problems of community disorder. That they never do so condemns them as morally bankrupt cowards living like leeches on the backs of the people. It seems they never will analyse their own position as doing so well involves their own elimination from more democratic and scientifically informed states.

Lawyers are a bunch of gutless wonders because they refuse to think broadly for themselves to point out some obvious routes for promoting flourishing communities instead of proliferating community disorder. To do so would be against the law. The law hates open operation as it goes against the legal privileges of secretly controlling information in order to come up with drivel bereft of broader community related aims, definitions, and any related handling to achieve or reflect on outcomes of practice. The practice of law is not a service, it is a domination, shrill in the case of aborigines and silently hidden where it really counts.

Lawyers might suggest how things might be done in a better world, but I don't think so. They are all making too much money off the backs of the Australian public as it is.

If you love your family and community, or love God or not, you and the Sopranos are perhaps on the same Christian lawyers' team of those who like their secret communications legally privileged. This was a key running joke on The Sopranos. (Sorry you missed it.)

MORE PERSONAL SUGGESTIONS RELATED TO MONEY AND WORKING FOR FREE. THIS MAY BE TO 'GIVE BACK' OR BECAUSE YOU DON'T WANT TO BE SEEN AS A CONSTANTLY MONEY GRABBING COMPARATIVELY RICH PRICK INTERNATIONALLY SPEAKING

Comparatively old rich Australians should be given encouragement to work for free quickly. This is so particularly in the case of men, because last in first off and the related queue principles have hindered better and fairer industrial organisation since the 19th century.

Personally, I have lost trust in most charities as they appear so often to proliferate in ways which involve comparatively closed family or related trusts for collection and tax deduction purposes, whether those 'giving back' ever appear to achieve anything much other than asking for more money to keep their organization and its managing members afloat, or not.

I am sick of the eternal bleating and whinging for money and entry, by well educated people who nevertheless appear incapable of suggesting what any democratically managing authority should **DO** about any problem such as illegal entry to any related land, community or occupational closure, from any broader scrutiny to ensure the public is served first.

All you ever hear from lawyers and their acolytes is bleating for more money for more people to be let into something. They are the only ones trusted to speak in many cases where the assumption is also that their privileges are identical with those of the broader population being kept in the dark, while lawyers control all speech, writing and affairs before court. Lawyers do this according to their own arcane drivel and cost schedules.

WHAT ARE YOU GOING TO DO ABOUT THE PROBLEM OF AN UNRULY FEW DESTROYING THE ASPIRATIONS OF ALL PEOPLE AROUND THEM? (SIT THERE AND WHINGE AGAINST COPS AS USUAL SO EVERYBODY GEARS UP WITH MORE GUNS FOR PROTECTION?)

BABY, HOW WOULD YOU MANAGE THE FUCKING PROBLEMS? (RUN TO A BRAIN-DEAD LAWYER WHO SOAKS THE REST OF US AS USUAL FOR THE NEXT BATTLE ROUND?)

Let me give a few more examples of what I hate about anything run by lawyers or the arseholes or poor sods forced to rely on this filth which is so obvious to see, for **anybody with the capacity to look broadly historically or geographically**. Lawyers have made law rule the humanities through their attachment to the military industrial, mining, construction and manufacturing states ruling over us. Reality, as Marx pointed out, is ideally lived the other way around, within the historical, geographical and related means or conditions of production. That complex rules the state through the Australian Constitution. **Ignorant voting does not give anyone an indication of anything very important in terms of delivering for the common good. This necessarily stands on and includes the planet earth and the trees, vegetation, buildings and creatures upon its land and in its waters.**

The more broadly and historically informed, that any voting or information giving and decision-making procedures are, the better service they should give to people beyond a comparatively evil cognoscenti keeping people in ignorance of the feudal envelope.

The common dictionary also abhors the rule of lawyers as the lawyer has always ruled according to ancient legal idiocies without well-defined social and environmental aims.

I have found the above out the hard way, partly by being on the strata committee on a strata housing plan since 1994. To avoid ignorant voting and any related fear of corruption, the first rule of business is that it should be made as clear, simple and honest as possible.

IN CONCLUSION, I SAY TO AMNESTY: WHY DESPISE CHINA, YOU FEUDAL FILTH? THE ANSWER IS BECAUSE YOU FEED LIKE LEECHES ON THE WELFARE STATE PRODUCED BY WORK WHICH IS PAID AND FREELY DONE BY OTHERS BEYOND YOUR FEUDAL BRETHERN. SEE RELATED RECOMMENDATIONS IN MY FORTHCOMING BOOK, POWER LOVING. SYNOPSES ARE ATTACHED. SEE MORE ON WWW.CAROLODONNELL.COM.AU

Like the US capacity to elevate the gun trade above all law by its entrenchment in the US Constitution, it is stinking feudal blood that produced these hiding feudal liars, dependent no longer on the Crown but on the rest of us. Get better thinkers and writers instead of lawyers.

Cheers

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

Hi Jocelyn

I tried to order your book **Lodestar China**, as above. Again it didn't work because I cannot put in my delivery address. Specifically, I live in Rosebank Street but the delivery specification form will only let me put Rose

Your book is unreasonably hard to get hold of in our day and age. Even if putting money into this format worked because of a correct direct delivery address, I would be unwilling to pay because presumably my name, address, email and credit card details would all be handed over. I can't and don't want to do it. (No smiley face.)

Your book launch with Stephen Fitzgerald, on the opposing hand, was very interesting and very funny. I too find the relationship between humour and candour extremely interesting, as well as being bad at saying no. I also remember the apple peel.

One may do well as a giggling girl but it doesn't go down well in the boardroom I found as one ages, for good and bad reasons, of course. To lean on the candour side, I can't wait to read more about your parents and your husband. He sounds like a spy and insurance fraudster. I can't wait to read your book. Bring one when you have time to meet and I will hand over the money immediately, trusting only you.

In regard to the self-sustaining venture you mention. The most self-sustaining one is free. In regard to exchanges, whenever they are made, I think people, whoever they are, should come back with a written report, on the utility of what they did or saw. This record is vital and it gave me the shits in the bureaucracy when they went on a junket and never made it. As a travelling grandma on my own money, I found I nearly always reported freely to politicians and others when back. The bureaucratic bastards wouldn't even let me go to Broken Hill and report back.

My wine may be cheap but my bookshelf is extensive. Nevertheless, I eventually found humour in **Chinese Life and Culture**. I think a good definition of humour, across many if not all societies, is:

'that which is different, but unexpectedly safe where it could be alarming.'

I just made that up because I think it applies from babies through to old women. I expect this is expressed in any related set of cultural power relations, including universities. (Let us tear into their faces, or not, as the case may be.)

Perhaps we can even do grandsons together. I have a half-Vietnamese six year old and will be taking him next Friday. How old is yours? Anyhow, no worries either way and I will see you at the end of the month when you have finished writing your journal article and have more time.

In answer to your question 'Have you been to Varuna'? My answer is that I'm not sure. I associate the place with Burt Evatt's residence where his study is the best room in the house, but I'm not sure if the house I think of in relation to Evatt and Eleanor Dark (?) is really Varuna. Life is endlessly imponderable and I am a seat of the pants kind of girl.

Let me leave you with the attached discussion of students who organised the Socialism Conference last year at Sydney University. They threw me out for racist speech but wouldn't tell me how or who it was that I offended. Let me tell you, Asia doesn't have a patent on authoritarian behaviour.

All in a day's work for grandmas as usual. I think Heydon Dyson's children should be encouraged to speculate about their father because few have ever been closer to him than they have. If I loved him I would want to try to defend his behaviour, wouldn't you? If you loved or hated your father, why would you want to shut up?

Cheers Carol
