



Angus McLeod &lt;angus.p.mcleod@gmail.com&gt;

---

**Gillard reflects**

10 messages

---

**Angus McLeod** <angus.p.mcleod@gmail.com> Sat, Sep 14, 2013 at 12:54 AM  
To: Rory McLeod <rory.i.mcleod@gmail.com>, Louise Quekett <louise@quekett.com>, Exchange <glen@mcleodlawyer.com>, Joanne McLeod <joanne@mcleodlawyer.com>

Well worth reading:

<http://www.theguardian.com/world/2013/sep/13/julia-gillard-labor-purpose-future>

---

**Glen McLeod** <glen@mcleodlawyer.com> Sat, Sep 14, 2013 at 1:48 AM  
To: Angus McLeod <angus.p.mcleod@gmail.com>  
Cc: Rory McLeod <rory.i.mcleod@gmail.com>, Louise Quekett <louise@quekett.com>, Joanne McLeod <joanne@mcleodlawyer.com>

It is interesting and makes some good points. I like the moments of personal reflection. However, it also displays many of her faults. What was her vision? The worst primary vote in a hundred years can't be explained away by reference to selected aspects of its culture and a few failed policies. The Coalition win was not the result copying Labor policy and duping the electorate. A subtext of the article is that Labor us true blue and all it needs to do is fix a few things up. Not good enough. Finally, it is not well written. It rambles and needs a good edit. Part of the problem is that it doesn't say enough in the space it occupies.

Thanks for sharing it with me.

On Saturday, 14 September 2013, Angus McLeod wrote:

Well worth reading:

<http://www.theguardian.com/world/2013/sep/13/julia-gillard-labor-purpose-future>

---

**Glen McLeod** - Consulting Lawyer

46 Money Street, Perth 6000 Australia T- (08) 64605179

[www.mcleodlawyer.com](http://www.mcleodlawyer.com) [glen@mcleodlawyer.com](mailto:glen@mcleodlawyer.com) ABN: 53156426836

Adjunct Professor - Murdoch University, Murdoch, WA, Australia 6150



NOTICE: If you are not an authorised recipient of this e-mail, please contact Glen McLeod at Glen McLeod, Consulting Lawyer immediately by return e-mail or by telephone on (08)64605179. You should not read, print, re-transmit, store or act in reliance on this e-mail or any attachments, and should destroy all copies of them. This e-mail and any attachments are confidential and may contain legally privileged information and/or copyright material of Glen McLeod, Consulting Lawyer or Glen McLeod Pty Ltd or third parties. You should only re-transmit or distribute or use the material if you are authorised to do so. Any legal privilege attaching to the contents of this e-mail or any attachments is expressly reserved and is not waived by any transmission to an unauthorised recipient. This notice should not be removed.

---

**Angus McLeod** <angus.p.mcleod@gmail.com>

Sat, Sep 14, 2013 at 2:43 AM

To: Glen McLeod &lt;glen@mcleodlawyer.com&gt;

Cc: Rory McLeod &lt;rory.i.mcleod@gmail.com&gt;, Louise Quekett &lt;louise@quekett.com&gt;, Joanne McLeod &lt;joanne@mcleodlawyer.com&gt;

I think what comes through quite clearly is a centre left social democratic vision. She is clearly of the view that the big social policies are what labor stands for. Whether we agree with it or not, it qualifies as a vision for society.

I think it would be much fairer to now ask what the vision of the coalition is (not just Tony Abbott, but the coalition). Like most successful oppositions in the history of democratic politics they have won office by presenting a small target and attacking the incumbent's soft spots. Nothing wrong with that at all. But now they have to craft a vision for the country and it's not clear at all what that will be. 'Stop the boats', 'end the waste' (etc.) are good slogans for an opposition party, but they do not qualify, individually or collectively, as a vision. Are they economic nationalists, liberals or conservatives? Social liberals or conservatives? Pragmatists or idealists? It will be interesting to see.

[Quoted text hidden]

---

**Joanne McLeod** <joanne@mcleodlawyer.com>

Sat, Sep 14, 2013 at 2:47 AM

To: Angus McLeod &lt;angus.p.mcleod@gmail.com&gt;

I think it's very good.

Thanks.

Mumxx

[Quoted text hidden]

—  
**Joanne McLeod** - Executive Assistant to Glen McLeod - Consulting Lawyer

46 Money Street, Perth 6000 Australia

T- (08) 64605179

[www.mcleodlawyer.com](http://www.mcleodlawyer.com) [glen@mcleodlawyer.com](mailto:glen@mcleodlawyer.com) ABN: 53156426836

NOTICE: If you are not an authorised recipient of this e-mail, please contact Joanne McLeod at Glen McLeod, Consulting Lawyer immediately by return e-mail or by telephone on (08)64605179. You should not read, print, re-transmit, store or act in reliance on this e-mail or any attachments, and should destroy all copies of them. This e-mail and any attachments are confidential and may contain legally privileged information and/or copyright material of Glen McLeod, Consulting Lawyer or Glen McLeod Pty Ltd or third parties. You should only re-transmit or distribute or use the material if you are authorised to do so. Any legal privilege attaching to the contents of this e-mail or any attachments is expressly reserved and is not waived by any transmission to an unauthorised recipient. This notice should not be removed.

---

**Glen McLeod** <glen@mcleodlawyer.com>

Sat, Sep 14, 2013 at 3:08 AM

To: Angus McLeod &lt;angus.p.mcleod@gmail.com&gt;

Cc: Rory McLeod &lt;rory.i.mcleod@gmail.com&gt;, Louise Quekett &lt;louise@quekett.com&gt;, Joanne McLeod &lt;joanne@mcleodlawyer.com&gt;

It's not about comparing Labor to the Coalition but Labor really doing some self reflecting. Labelling her statement as social democratic hides too many sins, the biggest being relevancy. The overtones of class war give away her lack of learning from her mistakes.

[Quoted text hidden]

---

**Angus McLeod** <angus.p.mcleod@gmail.com>

Sat, Sep 14, 2013 at 3:21 AM

To: Glen McLeod &lt;glen@mcleodlawyer.com&gt;

Cc: Rory McLeod &lt;rory.i.mcleod@gmail.com&gt;, Louise Quekett &lt;louise@quekett.com&gt;, Joanne McLeod &lt;joanne@mcleodlawyer.com&gt;

I know you don't agree with her vision, but that doesn't mean it's not a vision. I think it is hard to call her irrelevant when many of the labor policies have shaped public debate, e.g. schools, ndis, broadband, mining tax, carbon tax, refugees etc etc. There are many areas in which labor made significant changes from the Howard years as a result of their own vision of society as reflected in Gillard's views. You can say that that's irrelevant or smacks of class warfare, but those are expressions of a different political view, not indicative of a lack of coherence in her views. I don't agree with the labor position on a number of these policies too, but I wouldn't want to pretend that that is because their view is internally incoherent in some way. I think labor has done far too much self reflecting.

At the moment I'm far more interested in the Coalition's identity, which is far from clear. That's a genuine question. It is they who will be running the country for the next three years, not Labor. I'm actually sick of this focus on some kind of 'crisis' of identity in the labor party, particularly coming from the ABC. Labor had their turn. They lost. It's now the Coalition's turn and I would like to see some real leadership from them.

[Quoted text hidden]

---

**Glen McLeod** <glen@mcleodlawyer.com>

Sat, Sep 14, 2013 at 3:26 AM

To: Angus McLeod <angus.p.mcleod@gmail.com>

Cc: Rory McLeod <rory.i.mcleod@gmail.com>, Louise Quekett <louise@quekett.com>, Joanne McLeod <joanne@mcleodlawyer.com>

Agee that Coalition must prove itself but Lanor must now fix itself and doing what it has done in the past will be insanity.

[Quoted text hidden]

---

**Louise Quekett** <louise@quekett.com>

Mon, Sep 16, 2013 at 3:32 AM

To: Glen McLeod <glen@mcleodlawyer.com>

Cc: Angus McLeod <angus.p.mcleod@gmail.com>, Rory McLeod <rory.i.mcleod@gmail.com>, Joanne McLeod <joanne@mcleodlawyer.com>

Thank you for sending this interesting article. I have also followed the emails with interest. Whilst I agree with Glen that it could have been more tightly edited, I think this is more influenced by the fact that it is a personal reflective essay, and is an editorial choice not a mistake. Like dad, I too appreciated how much of herself she put into it. Perhaps tight editing would have removed something of the personal reflective touch. I think it is mistaken and just a bit petty to call it badly written.

Once again I'm struck by the clarity and reason of Angus' writing, especially (I am sorry to say) in comparison with Glen's - I can't even really call them 'arguments' - and general lack of coherence.

Dad, we all know that you are capable of much more nuanced thought and self expression. You are a deep thinker and a matchless writer of clear prose that expresses original and deeply thought out ideas. I know you are a busy person, but i would rather see just one paragraph of true, original, well-expressed and logical thought than several emails worth of unsubstantiated negativity. I don't have time to get into this very thoroughly, but you really have not made any real 'arguments' at all, just presented some really dubious statements, viz:

What was her vision? The worst primary vote in a hundred years can't be explained away by reference to selected aspects of its culture and a few failed policies. The Coalition win was not the result copying Labor policy and duping the electorate. A subtext of the article is that Labor us true blue and all it needs to do is fix a few things up. Not good enough

Angus' replies neatly and thoroughly tell us how she has definitely expressed her vision and the policies and legislation she put in place that substantially reflected this vision:

I know you don't agree with her vision, but that doesn't mean it's not a vision. I think it is hard to call her irrelevant when many of the labor policies have shaped public debate, e.g. schools, ndis, broadband, mining tax, carbon tax, refugees etc etc. There are many areas in which labor made significant changes from the Howard years as a result of their own vision of society as reflected in Gillard's views. You can say that that's irrelevant or smacks of class warfare, but those are expressions of a different political view, not indicative of a lack of coherence in her views. I don't agree with the labor position on a number of these policies too, but I wouldn't want to pretend that

that is because their view is internally incoherent in some way. I think labor has done far too much self reflecting.

I find it quite troubling Glen that you do not engage at all with the very interesting point Angus repeatedly brings up about the Coalition's essentially negative policy approach (I mean negative in its true non perjorative sense).

E  
Ed  
anargument[http://m.youtube.com/watch?v=rpcJpwUifpg&desktop\\_uri=%2Fwatch%3Fv%3DrpcJpwUifpg](http://m.youtube.com/watch?v=rpcJpwUifpg&desktop_uri=%2Fwatch%3Fv%3DrpcJpwUifpg)  
[Quoted text hidden]  
[Quoted text hidden]

**Louise Quekett** <louise@quekett.com>

Mon, Sep 16, 2013 at 3:53 AM

To: Glen McLeod <glen@mcleodlawyer.com>

Cc: Angus McLeod <angus.p.mcleod@gmail.com>, Rory McLeod <rory.i.mcleod@gmail.com>, Joanne McLeod <joanne@mcleodlawyer.com>

Sorry I mistakenly sent that off just then. Anyway, the whole email is finished below.

On 16/09/2013, at 3:32 PM, Louise Quekett <louise@quekett.com> wrote:

Thank you for sending this interesting article. I have also followed the emails with interest. Whilst I agree with Glen that it could have been more tightly edited, I think this is more influenced by the fact that it is a personal reflective essay, and is an editorial choice not a mistake. Like dad, I too appreciated how much of herself she put into it. Perhaps tight editing would have removed something of the personal reflective touch. I think it is mistaken and just a bit petty to call it badly written.

Once again I'm struck by the clarity and reason of Angus' writing, especially (I am sorry to say) in comparison with Glen's - I can't even really call them 'arguments' - and general lack of coherence.

Dad, we all know that you are capable of much more nuanced thought and self expression. You are a deep thinker and a matchless writer of clear prose that expresses original and deeply thought out ideas. I know you are a busy person, but I would rather see just one paragraph of true, original, well-expressed and logical thought than several emails worth of unsubstantiated negativity. I don't have time to get into this very thoroughly, but you really have not made any real 'arguments' at all, just presented some really dubious statements, viz:

What was her vision? The worst primary vote in a hundred years can't be explained away by reference to selected aspects of its culture and a few failed policies. The Coalition win was not the result copying Labor policy and duping the electorate. A subtext of the article is that Labor is true blue and all it needs to do is fix a few things up. Not good enough

Angus' replies neatly and thoroughly tell us how she has definitely expressed her vision and the policies and legislation she put in place that substantially reflected this vision:

I know you don't agree with her vision, but that doesn't mean it's not a vision. I think it is hard to call her irrelevant when many of the labor policies have shaped public debate, e.g. schools, ndis, broadband, mining tax, carbon tax, refugees etc etc. There are many areas in which labor made significant changes from the Howard years as a result of their own vision of society as reflected in Gillard's views. You can say that that's irrelevant or smacks of class warfare, but those are expressions of a different political view, not indicative of a lack of coherence in her views. I don't agree with the labor position on a number of these policies too, but I wouldn't want to pretend that that is because their view is internally incoherent in some way. I think labor has done far too much self reflecting.

I find it quite troubling Glen that you do not engage at all with the very interesting point Angus repeatedly brings up about the Coalition's essentially negative policy approach (I mean negative in its true non perjorative sense), as Angus repeatedly tries to infuse the conversation with new and interesting and really important ideas:

I think it would be much fairer to now ask what the vision of the coalition is (not just Tony Abbott, but the coalition). Like most successful oppositions in the history of democratic politics they have won office by presenting a small target and attacking the incumbent's soft spots. Nothing wrong with that at all. But now they have to craft a vision for the country and it's not clear at all what that will be. 'Stop the boats', 'end the waste' (etc.) are good slogans for an opposition party, but they do not qualify, individually or collectively, as a vision. Are they economic nationalists, liberals or conservatives? Social liberals or conservatives? Pragmatists or idealists? It will be interesting to see.

As far as i know, the Coalition has conveyed very little in the way of ideas, principles or values for which it stands and especially positive values "we stand for creating XYZ". Instead their ideology seems to be a pretty incoherent pile of negative statements ; "we'll stop this, we'll stop that". My personal view is that they are so incoherent they will struggle in government and really really struggle to show what they've stood for and achieved come the next election. However I am always happy to change my ideas, but anyone trying to do so will have to come up with an actual argument or at least an assertion followed by some simple corroborative examples in order to do so. Anyway this is not about my political beliefs; objectively I am really very interested in seeing what philosophy, if any, the coalition will adopt. Angus I think you could say a lot more on this and I would receive it with great interest.

Dad, as I've tried to make clear, I also respect your views above all, but I would really love to see them expressed in your true voice. Tired recycled insult-hurling is something we've probably all heard enough of.

Sorry if this is repetitive or incoherent bit I can't go back and edit due to lack of time.

Lots of love to you all

Lou xxx

[Quoted text hidden]

---

**Glen McLeod** <glen@mcleodlawyer.com>

Mon, Sep 16, 2013 at 11:36 PM

To: Louise Quekett <louise@quekett.com>

Cc: Angus McLeod <angus.p.mcleod@gmail.com>, Rory McLeod <rory.i.mcleod@gmail.com>, Joanne McLeod <joanne@mcleodlawyer.com>

Bit extreme in places and some good points. Clearly I shouldn't try to send emails from a rainy Street in Sydney, or perhaps at all!

Best wishes

Dad

On Monday, 16 September 2013, Louise Quekett wrote:

Sorry I mistakenly sent that off just then. Anyway, the whole email is finished below.

On 16/09/2013, at 3:32 PM, Louise Quekett <louise@quekett.com> wrote:

Thank you for sending this interesting article. I have also followed the emails with interest. Whilst I agree with Glen that it could have been more tightly edited, I think this is more influenced by the fact that it is a personal reflective essay, and is an editorial choice not a mistake. Like dad, I too appreciated how much of herself she put into it. Perhaps tight editing would have removed something of the personal reflective touch. I think it is mistaken and just a bit petty to call it badly written.



Once again I'm struck by the clarity and reason of Angus' writing, especially (I am sorry to say) in comparison with Glen's - I can't even really call them 'arguments' - and general lack of coherence.

Dad, we all know that you are capable of much more nuanced thought and self expression. You are a deep thinker and a matchless writer of clear prose that expresses original and deeply thought out ideas. I know you are a busy person, but i would rather see just one paragraph of true, original, well-expressed and logical thought than several emails worth of unsubstantiated negativity. I don't have time to get into this very thoroughly, but you really have not made any real 'arguments' at all, just presented some really dubious statements, viz:

What was her vision? The worst primary vote in a hundred years can't be explained away by reference to selected aspects of its culture and a few failed policies. The Coalition win was not the result copying Labor policy and duping the electorate. A subtext of the article is that Labor us true blue and all it needs to do is fix a few things up. Not good enough

Angus' replies neatly and thoroughly tell us how she has definitely expressed her vision and the policies and legislation she put in place that substantially reflected this vision:

I know you don't agree with her vision, but that doesn't mean it's not a vision. I think it is hard to call her irrelevant when many of the labor policies have shaped public debate, e.g. schools, ndis, broadband, mining tax, carbon tax, refugees etc etc. There are many areas in which labor made significant changes from the Howard years as a result of their own vision of society as reflected in Gillard's views. You can say that that's irrelevant or smacks of class warfare, but those are expressions of a different political view, not indicative of a lack of coherence in her views. I don't agree with the labor position on a number of these policies too, but I wouldn't want to pretend that that is because their view is internally incoherent in some way. I think labor has done far too much self reflecting.

I find it quite troubling Glen that you do not engage at all with the very interesting point Angus repeatedly brings up about the Coalition's essentially negative policy approach (I mean negative in its true non perjorative sense), as Angus repeatedly tries to infuse the conversation with new and interesting and really important ideas:

I think it would be much fairer to now ask what the vision of the coalition is (not just Tony Abbott, but the coalition). Like most successful oppositions in the history of democratic politics they have won office by presenting a small target and attacking the incumbent's soft spots. Nothing wrong with that at all. But now they have to craft a vision for the country and it's not clear at all what that will be. 'Stop the boats', 'end the waste' (etc.) are good slogans for an opposition party, but they do not qualify, individually or collectively, as a vision. Are they economic nationalists, liberals or conservatives? Social liberals or conservatives? Pragmatists or idealists? It will be interesting to see.

As far as i know, the Coalition has conveyed very little in the way of ideas, principles or values for which it stands and especially positive values "we stand for creating XYZ". Instead their ideology seems to be a pretty incoherent pile of negative statements ; "we'll stop this, we'll stop that". My personal view is that they are so incoherent they will struggle in government and really really struggle to show what they've stood for and achieved come the next election. However I am always happy to change my ideas, but anyone trying to do so will have to come up with an actual argument or at least an assertion followed by some simple corroborative examples in order to do so. Anyway this is not about my political beliefs; objectively I am really very interested in seeing what philosophy, if any, the coalition will adopt. Angus I think you could say a lot more on this and I would receive it with great interest.

Dad, as I've tried to make clear, I also respect your views above all, but I would really love to see them

expressed in your true voice. Tired recycled insult-hurling is something we've probably all heard enough of.

Sorry if this is repetitive or incoherent but I can't go back and edit due to lack of time.

Lots of love to you all

Lou xxx

E  
Ed

anargument[Stop The Boats | Wednesday Night Fever | Wednesdays 9.30pm ABC1](#)  
On 14/09/2013, at 3:26 PM, Glen McLeod <[glen@mcleodlawyer.com](mailto:glen@mcleodlawyer.com)> wrote:

Agee that Coalition must prove itself but Lanor must now fix itself and doing what it has done in the past will be insanity.

On Saturday, 14 September 2013, Angus McLeod wrote:

I know you don't agree with her vision, but that doesn't mean it's not a vision. I think it is hard to call her irrelevant when many of the labor policies have shaped public debate, e.g. schools, ndis, broadband, mining tax, carbon tax, refugees etc etc. There are many areas in which labor made significant changes from the Howard years as a result of their own vision of society as reflected in Gillard's views. You can say that that's irrelevant or smacks of class warfare, but those are expressions of a different political view, not indicative of a lack of coherence in her views. I don't agree with the labor position on a number of these policies too, but I wouldn't want to pretend that that is because their view is internally incoherent in some way. I think labor has done far too much self reflecting.

At the moment I'm far more interested in the Coalition's identity, which is far from clear. That's a genuine question. It is they who will be running the country for the next three years, not Labor. I'm actually sick of this focus on some kind of 'crisis' of identity in the labor party, particularly coming from the ABC. Labor had their turn. They lost. It's now the Coalition's turn and I would like to see some real leadership from them.

On Sat, Sep 14, 2013 at 3:08 PM, Glen McLeod <[glen@mcleodlawyer.com](mailto:glen@mcleodlawyer.com)> wrote:

It's not about comparing Labor to the Coalition but Labor really doing some self reflecting. Labelling her statement as social democratic hides too many sins, the biggest being relevancy. The overtones of class war give away her lack of learning from her mistakes.

On Saturday, 14 September 2013, Angus McLeod wrote:

I think what comes through quite clearly is a centre left social democratic vision. She is clearly of the view that the big social policies are what labor stands for. Whether we agree with it or not, it qualifies as a vision for society.

I think it would be much fairer to now ask what the vision of the coalition is (not just Tony Abbott, but the coalition). Like most successful oppositions in the history of democratic politics they have won office by presenting a small target and attacking the incumbent's soft spots. Nothing wrong with that at all. But now they have to craft a vision for the country and it's not clear at all what that will be. 'Stop the boats', 'end the waste' (etc.) are good slogans for an opposition party, but they do not qualify, individually or collectively, as a vision. Are they economic nationalists, liberals or conservatives? Social liberals or conservatives? Pragmatists or idealists? It will be interesting to

see.

On Sat, Sep 14, 2013 at 1:48 PM, Glen McLeod  
<glen@mcleodlawyer.com> wrote:

It is interesting and makes some good points. I like the moments of personal reflection. However, it also displays many of her faults. What was her vision? The worst primary vote in a hundred years can't be explained away by reference to selected aspects of its culture and a few failed policies. The Coalition win was not the result copying Labor policy and duping the electorate. A subtext of the article is that Labor is true blue and all it needs to do is fix a few things up. Not good enough. Finally, it is not well written. It rambles and needs a good edit. Part of the problem is that it doesn't say enough in the space it occupies.

Thanks for sharing it with me.

On Saturday, 14 September 2013, Angus McLeod wrote:  
Well worth reading:

[Quoted text hidden]