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Appendices

All Appendices referenced in this book, of news articles, correspondence, TV media and various other supporting documents can be viewed on my website at myfightforsight.com on the Appendices page. All references are also clickable links to my website.

TV Media videos can be viewed on my YouTube channel. See the TV Media link on the Appendices page on my website at myfightforsight.com
‘You can’t go back and change the beginning, but you can start where you are and change the ending’

C. S. Lewis
Preface

Blindness is one of the most feared impairments anyone can suffer. Yet blindness from GLAUCOMA is PREVENTABLE!

GLAUCOMA is responsible for about 20% of all causes of blindness, worldwide and is no respecter of race, creed or colour! Young or old we’re all at risk!

An estimated 300,000* Australians are affected by this insidious eye disease. I am myself, a victim.

What would be YOUR worst nightmare?

Thirty years ago I set out to disseminate information concerning GLAUCOMA in the hope of helping to prevent avoidable blindness in our community. But sadly, my efforts were perverted by persons with vested interests, by any means, including attempted murder!

After decades of disillusionment I’m tired of being swept under the carpet. There are still significant issues that need urgent attention.

I tell my story in the hope of making a difference.

A legacy aimed to create awareness of glaucoma and thereby avoid preventable blindness in Australia.

All I ask of YOU is to read on!

Thank you
Rolf Kaiser
June, 2018

* Source: Glaucoma Australia
Part 1

Living with the glaucoma awareness campaign

I Fear, by going public with my book, I forfeited my Life...
But the Truth will prevail!
Introduction

In 1967 my wife and I, with three young children, emigrated from West Germany to Australia as permanent settlers. We settled in Melbourne, Victoria until 1971 when we moved to Albury in country New South Wales and where we still reside.

In early 1986 I was diagnosed with glaucoma. In that same year my wife and I engaged in a national glaucoma awareness campaign using our own resources and monies.

In August 1986 I launched the establishment of a foundation for the promotion and prevention of blindness from glaucoma within Australia. Following the announcement of the foundation, I was invited to appear on the *Ray Martin Midday Show*.

The events that followed are recorded in Minutes on official letterhead of the Royal College of Ophthalmology, Sydney:

> On 3 September, 1986 the first meeting of ‘The National Glaucoma Foundation of Australia’ (now better known as ‘Glaucoma Australia’) was held at the Royal College of Ophthalmology in Sydney.

**See Appendices: Meeting Minutes**

Due to the unethical manipulation by Dr Ivan Goldberg, a Sydney based Ophthalmologist and Committee members; I was forced to resign from the Foundation in January 1987. It became apparent that all Committee members, with the exception of me, were patients of Dr Goldberg. The members who formed the Committee were admitted by Dr Goldberg. These matters are well documented in the Foundation’s meeting minutes.

A short time later one of them received the Order of Australia! It wouldn’t take much to guess or figure out who instigated this.

**I too was on the receiving end, namely two .38-calibre bullets. Fired at close range!**
Dr Goldberg is now a Professor of Ophthalmology and a Member of the Order of Australia.

Matters concerning the establishment of the Glaucoma Foundation are written in works submitted by Eric Kaiser, (ID 89082634), Deacon University:

- Essay: Science and Society, HUS408;
- Assignment Four, Topic two: Suppression in Science
- Thesis: The Politics of Preventive Eye Care

Eric Kaiser was awarded a two year fully paid post-graduate research scholarship at Deakin University.

See Appendices: E. Kaiser Thesis Paper
Chronology of Events

1986–1990
On 9 April 1987, the ‘Rolf Kaiser National Glaucoma Awareness’ campaign was officially launched in Albury, by the Honorable Tim Fischer MP, Member for Farrer and Shadow Minister for Veterans Affairs.

At the same time the first copies of my booklet *Glaucoma, IT CAN SEND YOU BLIND* were printed. My booklet was written, in layman’s terms, the first of its kind, written and produced in Australia. (Paid for out of my own pocket.)

From 1986 until the end of 1990 we travelled by car and caravan criss-crossing the states of Victoria, New South Wales, the ACT and into Queensland, giving exhibitions and lectures at shopping centres, banks and wherever we received permission ‘to set up shop’, with the aim of distributing information designed to inform the unwary general public of the dangers of glaucoma.

Permission was asked for and granted by the ACT Administration to set up our car and caravan display on the lawns in front of Parliament House, for seven days. We talked to federal Ministers and Parliamentarians on the issue of glaucoma. Furthermore, a petition with about 3000 signatures calling on the Federal government to initiate a glaucoma prevention program was handed over to the office of the then Minister for Health, Neal Blewett.
Our campaign was well received and documented by the Australian news media including television, newspapers and radio.

SBS TV’s *Vox Populi* came to Albury to make a documentary.

See Appendices: TV Media: SBS TV Documentary

The University of Sydney included me in their documentary *Seeing into the Future*, to be screened on the ABC program *Quantum*. I received and still have a complimentary copy of the finished TV documentary in my possession.

Sadly the documentary was never shown by the ABC. Reason: because I stated that Australia was lagging behind, other civilised countries, by about 10–15 years, in terms of this preventable cause of blindness. And still is. **As of this very day!**

See Appendices: TV Media: Documentary: Seeing into the Future

Many news articles were written and TV news items shown about my/our efforts to prevent unnecessary blindness caused by glaucoma. Many of the herewith referred to news items are recorded and in my possession. They are also available from the archives of the various news media around the country.

See Appendices: Part 1 and Part 2

*Albury-Wodonga* Border Morning Mail, 10 April 1987
In the period from 1986 to late 1990 I received several threatening telephone calls. I particularly remember one call because the welfare of my grandchildren was threatened.

I was also deliberately run off the road by a person or persons unknown. At another time it was only my quick reaction that saved me from getting run over by a car that was deliberately aimed at me, missing me by only inches. This happened in front of my wife and grandson.

All these matters were reported to the police.

Sadly our campaign ended in 1990 due to lack of funding. Having spent what meagre resources we had to start off with and monies provided by my overseas relatives. With sadness we sold the caravan to repay the bank for a personal loan we had obtained. We finished up with nothing but a bad taste in our mouths. Nevertheless, from that day on I never missed an opportunity to inform anyone willing to listen about the dangers of glaucoma and how to avoid blindness from this terrible affliction. And I still do!

1990

In 1990 I became aware that my treating eye specialist, Dr James La Nauze, wrote false and misleading medical reports concerning the state and progression of my glaucoma. An example of this is as follows:

\[
\text{In correspondence to my solicitor, Dr La Nauze stated that my condition was well under control and likely to remain so with the present treatment. At the same time he was urging me to have further surgery because I was losing my vision.}
\]

I confronted Dr La Nauze with this contradiction. I lost faith in the doctor’s ability to save my eyesight. It was at this point that I severed my relationship with Dr La Nauze. Given that there were, at the same clinic, several other Ophthalmologists, I envisaged consulting one of them.

Having obtained a new referral from my GP I visited the clinic to make an appointment to see one of the other specialists. To my surprise and dismay I was point blank refused to be seen by any of the other Ophthalmologists.
1992
In order to ascertain the true state of my eyes my solicitor made an appointment with Dr Michael Delaney an Ophthalmologist based in Sydney. A date was confirmed for me to travel to Sydney for the examination. Following the examination of my eyes we received a medical report from Dr Delaney, dated the 15 December 1992.

In his report Dr Delaney confirmed that my glaucoma was not well controlled and I was losing my vision. To my astonishment he stated that this was due to me choosing not to attend for further treatment, over the passed two years.

Records obtained from Medicare revealed that in the period, referred to by Dr Delaney, I had in fact attended for treatment by eye specialists nine (9) times. Seven of these consultations were with Dr James La Nauze, my treating Ophthalmologist.

1993
In correspondence from my solicitor to Dr Delaney, Dr Delaney was informed of the dates of my attendances for treatment and was requested that the report be amended. Dr Delaney, in correspondence to my solicitor, dated 29 April, 1993, refused to amend his report in any way.

Given that I had paid for said report, I brought this matter to the attention of the Office of Consumer Affairs. A hearing took place in Sydney. I attended the hearing. Dr Delaney only submitted a Statutory Declaration into evidence. The said Statutory Declaration makes compelling reading, in spite of being made fully aware of the dates of my attendances for ophthalmic specialist treatment. Dr Delaney repeated again and again and page after page the falsity, that I chose, not to attend for further treatment, and that this was the cause of my loss of vision.

My efforts to inform the presiding adjudicator of those falsities fell on deaf ears. I was told by the adjudicator to be silent or he would ask me to leave.

He, point blank, refused to peruse the evidence I offered.

My case was dismissed in favour of Dr Delaney.

Dr Delaney now stands accused of committing the act of ‘perjury and perverting’ the course of justice. The events referred to are documented in a Statutory Declaration. The veracity of my allegations is well documented!
Recently I was shocked to discover Dr Jamie La Nauze on the board of directors of the ‘Fred Hollows Foundation’. Yes, the very same ophthalmologist, directly responsible for the preventable loss of sight, to my right eye. He, Dr La Nauze, nearly cost me my sight in the other eye too. I was lucky by having refused an operation on my left eye.

The very same Dr La Nauze is now a Director of a foundation claiming it can restore eyesight for $25 and channels millions of Australian dollars overseas. This also raises the question:

*What is done for the blind and vision impaired persons in Australia? And how many Australians have their eyesight restored by the Fred Hollows Foundation?*

In the years that followed I kept trying, but in vain, to seek assistance from various organisations such as the Health Care Complaints Commission, Ombudsman, Medical Association, Human Rights Commission, Legal Aid Commission, The Commission Against Corruption and others.

All my attempts were to no avail. My efforts are documented and on record.

**1997**

On 29 July, 1997 I was nominated for the Order of Australia.

See Appendices: Correspondence: Order of Australia

My perseverance in pursuing awareness of glaucoma and justice went not unnoticed!
**2 May, 2001**

At approximately 12.50am, my wife and I answered a knock at the front door to two persons claiming to be police officers. On confirming their question if I was Rolf Kaiser, I was shot point blank twice with a heavy .38 calibre revolver.

The bullets went through both of my upper thighs and through my wife’s nightgown. My wife was standing behind me at that time. What saved me from certain death is the fact that I was standing about a foot higher than the shooter and I was wearing a big nightgown; this must have confused the shooter. This, and what I believe is, that the gun barrel was prevented from raising further-up by the scroll on the security door. The path of the bullets revealed the gun was aimed at my torso. This and my quick reaction of slamming the door shut saved my life.

*Given that the two hired assailants wore no disguises leads to the conclusion that, had they been successful in killing me, my wife would have, most certainly been murdered, too!* 

Later in hospital the attending surgeon expressed his surprise that I had survived the attack. He stated that if one of the bullets had severed a main artery I most certainly would have bled to death!

The police investigation that followed concluded that a contract had been taken out to have me killed. Detective Gavin Nicholson of the Albury Police Command was in charge of the investigation.
Following the shooting, my wife and I were diagnosed with severe post-traumatic stress disorder and for approximately three years we both received professional physiological trauma counselling, provided by the Office of the Attorney General, New South Wales. But despite several supporting medical reports from our counsellors, providing compelling evidence to the severity of our trauma and the devastating effect this had on our lives, compensation was denied. Supporting medical reports from two independent assessors provided to the Attorney General’s office were to no avail. On appeal I did receive the sum of $13,000 for the physical injuries I sustained.

**In spite of the documented supporting medical evidence, my wife and I have never received any compensation for the severe post-traumatic stress we suffer!**

As of this very day I am still plagued by severe nightmares and flashbacks of the incident. This has driven me several times in the past to the brink of ending my life. I am unable to cope by myself. My wife has to be constantly with me, I am prone to panic.

**2003–2004**

Controversy surrounds the police investigation. Approximately ten months into the investigation I was effectively cut off from any access to the investigating detective. Every request I made to speak with the detective was declined for reasons unknown. A year or so later Detective Nicholson resigned from the Force. No other case officer was ever assigned to continue the investigation into the attempt on my life.

About that time I believed I became aware of the identity of one of the assailants. I began my own research into this person’s motive to do me harm. During the 18 months it took me to research and finalise a Statutory Declaration, I kept Detective Hargraves well informed about my work and progress of same.

On the 25 November 2003, I handed over to the Chief of Detectives, Hugh Hargraves my Statutory Declaration.

Furthermore, as I stated in my Statutory Declaration, that I believed to have recognised a Robert H. as one of the two assailants on the night of 2 May 2001. Over the following months I made several enquiries with the police concerning the investigation of my allegations against H. but was advised that Detective Hargraves was on sick leave. To my questions about the whereabouts of my Statutory Declaration I was advised that this document would be locked up in Detective Hargrave’s safe.
In the weeks following I kept on making efforts to get some answers. Finally, I was informed by Inspector Les Nugent that Detective Hugh Hargraves would not be coming back on duty and that his office had searched for the missing documents, but without results. Three months after handing over the said document to Detective Hargraves, I was told that the documents were located at the private home of Detective Hargraves. To the best of my knowledge the matters referred to in my Statutory Declaration were never investigated.

As stated in my letter of 2 June 2004, to the local Area Commander, Superintendent of Police JM Devine:

“And my personal dealings with Detectives Nicholson and Hargraves I believe that the investigation into the attempted murder was at best incompetent or at worst corrupt.”

The controversy surrounding the ‘missing’ documents is well documented and is in my possession.

The Albury Area Police Command stands accused of hushing-up an attempted murder, possibly an attempted double murder!

In order to get an insight of my allegation, I refer to some of the correspondence to and from the Albury Police Command.

See Appendices: Correspondence: Albury Police Command

2010
At an off-chance I met Inspector Moody on the street, in Albury. The Inspector was recently assigned to the Albury Police Command and had no prior knowledge of the attempt upon my life. I took this opportunity, telling my story to the Inspector.

2011
On 26 October 2011, I contacted the Office of Crimes Statistics New South Wales enquiring as to who provides
the department with the data on crimes committed within New South Wales and who compiles the data into the crime statistics.

In reply I received an email dated 26 October 2011, which reads:

“The recorded crime data we report on comes from the quarterly extracts we receive from the NSW Police Forces’ Computerised Operational Policing System (COPS)”

Further enquiries to the Office of Crimes Statistics NSW resulted in an email from the NSW Bureau of Crime Statistics and Research dated 27 October 2011 which reads:

The recorded crime data we report on comes from the NSW Police Forces’ Computerised Operational Policing System (COPS). Therefore if the shooting comes to the attention of the police it would show up in our crime statistics.

Correspondence to Elizabeth Stirton, Superintendent of Police, 6 November 2011:

Dear Madam,

An enquiry was made on my behalf, by DAIS, to the Albury Local Police regarding an attempt on my life in 2001. The Albury Police responded by letter dated 19 May 2011, which is signed by the Acting Superintendent, BM Blanchard, Police Local Area Commander.

In said letter, Acting Superintendent, BM Blanchard, referred to the attempted murder as an “alleged shooting”.

Furthermore, the Acting Superintendent stated that the documents contained in the original investigation carried out by former Detective Senior Constable Nicholson were reviewed and the Commander was satisfied the investigation was conducted in a satisfactory manner. Why then is it that the documents referred to have disappeared?
I refer to a copy of a letter forwarded to me by the Manager, Disability Advocacy and Information Service (DAIS) dated 31 October 2011, addressed to Albury Police.

I responded to the abovementioned letter as follows:

“The shooting was in fact an attempted murder! Detective Nicholson has told me so on several occasions, in the presence of my wife Erika Kaiser and Detective Smith that he had drawn the conclusion that this was, in his, professional opinion, a contract to have me killed! The shooting resulted in my admission to hospital with two serious gunshot wounds caused by two .38 calibre bullets.

I am appalled that this incident, which nearly cost me my life, is now an ‘alleged shooting’.”

Regards
Rolf Kaiser

About 18 months after the shooting a gun was found near where I was shot. The gun was of the same calibre used on me, the owner of said gun lived just a few streets away from me. The gun was used in a murder in Albury, one year and two days after I was shot.

The victim lived only one street away from my residence!

It should be noted that the two referred to persons were unknown to me.

Given the fact that the gun was of the same calibre used on me, I believe it to be only natural of me to ask if there was any link.

The police ignored my frequent requests for a copy of the ballistics test results, on the revolver found and the two projectiles, found in my home.

Over the years that followed I attempted to find the answers to the puzzle, but to no avail. Now, thanks to the effort of DAIS, I recently received a copy of the crime statistics for the year 2001 recorded by the NSW Bureau of Crime Statistics and Research.

The statistics show no records of a crime involving a firearm, shooting, or an attempted murder for the month of May 2001, in the Albury Local Area Command.
2016
22 March 2016
Elizabeth Stirton
Superintendent
Albury Local Area Commander
Re: attempted murder
Dear Commander,

I make reference to my correspondence of 6 November 2011 and to your reply, dated 6 December 2011.

In your reply you advised, I quote:

“I am advised the incident subject of your complaint was recorded as Shoot with Intent (other than Attempted Murder) and the search conducted on your behalf may not have captured this”.

Recently, Amanda Ledwidge, from Outreach Australia, contacted the NSW Bureau of Crime Statistics, requesting information concerning the Albury Local Area Command.

The information received recorded no incident of an attempted murder nor of any ‘Shoot with Intent’, for 2 May 2001. In fact there is no shooting recorded at all, on that day!

Further enquiries, conducted by Ruth Lamperd, a journalist from the Melbourne Sun Herald newspaper, got the same negative response from the Bureau of Statistics, no record of a “shooting with intent” and no attempted murder.

I would appreciate your reply.

Regards
Rolf Kaiser

RE: ‘Shoot with intent’
If the matter of attempted murder would not be so serious, the Commander’s reply would be, laughable!

Please see Appendices for a copy of the letter dated 31 October 2011 sent by DAIS to Inspector Moodie. The letter relates to the issue of the missing Witness Statements.

See Appendices: Correspondence: Inspector Moodie
The additional material referred to by Inspector Cottee as ‘recently’ supplied by Mr Kaiser, was in the form of a Statutory Declaration signed by my hand in the presence of a Justice of the Peace on 1 May 2003. The Statutory Declaration was handed to Detective Sergeant Hargraves, who was the Chief of Detectives at the time.

The Statutory Declaration disappeared, so too did the replacement Statutory Declaration handed to Inspector Dave Cottee!

Furthermore, in 2002, the *Border Mail* newspaper published the 2001 crime figures for Albury. I was at the time astonished by the absence of any reference to the serious crime of an attempted murder.

Over the years that followed I attempted to find the answers to the puzzle, but to no avail.

Finally, I refer to what a friend told me shortly after the incident on 2 May 2001. She informed me that she overheard a part of a conversation between a police officer and another person. She claimed that the police officer said “he is a German; they should have done a better job”. At the time I dismissed this as being far-fetched. She also expressed her belief that the Police were behind the attempt on my life. Sadly her statements cannot be confirmed as she passed away a short time ago.
Local Eye Care Denied

At the time that I left the service provided by Dr La Nauze I was still a patient of the Albury Eye Clinic. My medical files were never requested nor transferred to any other eye specialist. The refusal of further ongoing ophthalmic treatment is and was in breach of duty of care. Dr Heery and his colleagues, who are unknown to me, stand accused of professional negligence. Their deplorable refusal of ophthalmic care by the Albury Eye clinic has caused blindness in one eye, and caused great distress to me.

Still to this very day, they refuse to attend to my ophthalmic needs.

Despite the fact that Dr La Nauze has left the eye clinic a long time ago, the clinic still refuses to accept any and every referral from my GP or physician.

The ban has even extended into a publicly funded institution, namely the Albury Base Hospital. In the past the local ophthalmologists have refused calls for assistance made by the emergency department of the said hospital. These events have been documented in a Statutory Declaration.

In sheer desperation I travelled to various cities seeking assistance to save the eyesight in my left eye. Every ophthalmologist I consulted told me that my condition was too well advanced and therefore needed to be in the care of local eye specialists, in Albury.

Of late I have suffered a detached retina in the left eye. This occurred during an overseas visit to see my sister in Cologne, Germany. I was treated there. The specialist was able the reattach my Retina.

I was able to return to Australia under the condition to immediately be put under the care of a local ophthalmologist for urgent further treatments.

Upon our return to Albury attempts were made to secure the much-needed service of a retina specialist at the Albury eye clinic.

The request was refused by the eye clinic.
I was forced to travel on several occasions to Melbourne for urgent surgery and follow-up care. Unfortunately there was a delay of several months before I was able to secure an appointment with the eye and ear hospital. But by that time, I had lost a considerable amount of vision, previously saved by the German eye specialist!

I am now at high risk of a further detachment, which could happen at any time. Should this occur, urgent ophthalmic care from a retina specialist would be required to avoid certain blindness!

Although there is a retina specialist at the Albury clinic, any attempt to secure such assistance in an emergency has been in vain. Presentation made on my behalf to the Albury Base Hospital only confirms that no such assistance would be forthcoming from anyone, at all, from the Albury eye clinic!

It is my understanding that Dr Heery is behind this ‘black ban’ and I strongly suspect that he has instructed his medical colleagues to follow suit. I have met Dr Heery only once and that was at a medical exhibition held in Albury. I had approached him with a question concerning glaucoma. He walked away from me with the words “You bloody German bastard”.

I categorically state that I have never done anything that would warrant such deplorable, unprofessional and unethical action against me. On several occasions Dr Heery was contacted in writing, requesting an explanation for his action. But no reply has ever been received. Again, those events are well documented.

There is little doubt in my mind that the attempt upon my life was instigated to silence me, organised and financed by someone either alone or in concert with others. Evidence suggests that the intended killing can also be linked to the denial of ophthalmic care, by the Albury Eye Clinic.
Conclusion

I am deeply saddened by the fact that the awareness campaign, which was designed to help prevent further unnecessary blindness from glaucoma to fellow Australians, has been effectively derailed by persons with vested interests.

Sadly the opportunity has been lost to inform an estimated 300,000 Australian glaucoma sufferers. Many are unaware that they suffer from this insidious disease thereby, at high risk, of losing their vision.

Since the end of my campaign our lives have been in ruins. I have lost complete faith in justice and the system at large. The organisations I turned to for help and assistance, are, in my opinion, self-serving and ineffective.

My wife now suffers from mental problems.

We have been abandoned by our children, grandchildren and great-grandchildren alike.

Most of our overseas relatives and friends have passed away. Our Australian friends we can count on one hand, with three fingers missing!

Not only do I live in daily fear of losing my vision in the remaining eye but also in fear for my life. Each night as it turns dark, we barricade ourselves in our home, with steel plates on our windows, steel bars across our doors and an alarm system in place.

Since the attempt on my life we rarely leave our home after dark and then only in the company of others.

Our fears are not unfounded. Since the shooting several incidents have occurred. We have been followed, watched, threatened and menaced.

Our mailbox was blown up. At one time, during the night, someone was on our roof, presumably to gain access to the house.
The matters in my book will no longer be swept under the carpet, out of sight. I am going public with my story and let the truth speak for itself.

If you believe, as I do, that in a civilised country like Australia, nobody should lose his or her precious eyesight from a preventable cause, then please pass this on by any means available!

With my sincere thanks,
Rolf L. Kaiser
Part 2

The quest for glaucoma awareness
Introduction

By now you have read Part 1 of my book and I think it may be appropriate to inform you that the second part of my book may cause you some disturbance. However, I am compelled to include my experiences over the past three years, which cost me dearly in terms of my personal health and also brought me to the brink of bankruptcy, in the hope my story will lead to changes in the system and will benefit the whole of the Australian community. The main benefit will be to spare the individual from going through the same hell as I do.

To be told that you face blindness is bad news in itself, but to find out that this blindness is totally avoidable is sheer agony! Part 2 of my book is an honest attempt to rectify an intolerable situation that exists in this country and to bring to you an understanding of the need for changes in terms of education, prevention and better management of preventable eye diseases in general.

If you believe as I do, that we all have a moral obligation to make Australia a better place to live in, you will agree that the issues raised in this book have to be resolved in the earliest possible time. Let’s not deny anyone the pleasure of seeing this beautiful country of ours. Eliminating one cause of blindness, namely glaucoma, would be a magnificent victory, even if the other causes of blindness were unaffected. It is because the numbers of eye diseases are so great that partial success in the effort to treat and prevent blindness from glaucoma must be sought by all available means.

Rolf Kaiser
2 December 1988
The Medical Profession

What role could the General Practitioner (GP) play in the prevention of blindness from glaucoma? Nowadays we know which categories of people are high risks for contracting glaucoma. Furthermore, most of them are already in the care of their doctors for treatment of the following ailments:

- Systemic Hypertension (high blood pressure)
- Diabetes (high blood sugar levels)
- Arteriole-Sclerosis (closing of the arteries)
- Anaemia (bloodlessness)
- Cataracts (cloudy or opaque lens)
- Myopia (short sightedness)

Other people considered high-risk are those over 35 years of age and those with a family history of glaucoma.

So the GP is well placed in identifying these people and should recommend an eye test for glaucoma, or better still, have the knowledge and equipment to do the test themselves. From my experiences I believe that the Federal Minister for Health, Doctor Neil Blewett, is correct when he stated that:

“...there may be some (I suspect very few) general practitioners who have a special interest and expertise in this area...” (In a letter to the Member for Farrer, Mr Tim Fischer MP, dated 19 November, 1987)

The Ophthalmologist is a professional eye specialist. He is a qualified medical doctor who is trained in providing total care of the eyes, including all diagnostic techniques for detecting eye diseases, including glaucoma. It is a matter of great concern to me that in most cases it takes weeks or even months to get an appointment to see an ophthalmologist. What are the reasons for this? Could it be that there are not enough eye specialists in this country? Could that account for the fact that the issues concerning glaucoma were not brought to the attention of the relevant government departments, medical doctors and the Australian public at large?
If all the people in high-risk categories would seek medical attention from the existing number of ophthalmologists in Australia it would show up the fact that there is an inadequate level of professional eye care in this country. With this fact in mind one must ask what actions have been taken by the Royal College of Ophthalmologists and the Australian Foundation for the Prevention of Blindness which were set up and run by ophthalmologists to inform the Australian public of the causes of preventable blindness.

I would also like to know what the reasons are for the fact that the Australian Institute of Health, a federally funded body charged with the task of detecting and reporting upon health issues, is unaware of the facts concerning glaucoma. In another letter to Mr Tim Fischer MP, dated 25 August, 1988, Dr. Blewett writes:

> “The Australian Institute of Health, as one of its functions, makes recommendations on the prevention and treatment of diseases, and the improvement and promotion of health and health awareness of the people of Australia. However, while an assessment of the diagnostic techniques of computerised Perimetry is in progress, the Institute lacks expertise in ophthalmology and to date has undertaken no investigations directly relevant to Mr Kaiser’s concerns”.

I am also stunned to find that one of the major universities lacks knowledge on the subject. A letter requesting information on glaucoma from the Department of Social and Preventive Medicine at Monash University in Melbourne met with the following reply:

> “I regret that the Department cannot be very helpful in supplying you with information on Chronic Open Angle Glaucoma. We have no current or past involvement in this research nor are we aware of any ongoing research in this field”. (Signed by T. S. Selwood, Senior Lecturer dated 5 October, 1988)
There remains a question of civic and moral duties. In many civilised countries there exist laws that govern the behaviour of their citizens in this regard. For example, if you are aware of a crime in progress you are required to report this to the appropriate authorities. Similar obligations exist in the rendering of assistance at a road accident and so on. In the case of the medical profession, and others, who have been aware of the facts concerning glaucoma and the devastating effects it has at both individual and at community levels. What, you may ask, have they done in terms of fulfilling their civic and moral duties?

I claim they have not done enough in terms of prevention of blindness caused by glaucoma.

With glaucoma being known as the ‘Sneak Thief’ of Sight’, would not the inaction of those aware of this thievery, such as the medical profession and others in the know, be criminally negligent?
The Optometrist

The Optometrist is in the front line of early detection of glaucoma and other eye disorders. Given that about 62% of Australians use spectacles in their daily routine and optometrists carry out approximately 80% of all eye examinations for spectacles, provides an excellent opportunity for early diagnosis of glaucoma. Unfortunately, as in my case, the test was not carried out even though I was in a high-risk category, having Myopia and being over 35 years of age.

I am disturbed by the fact that in the past three years of my Awareness Campaign I have been contacted by many people from around Australia with similar experiences. On the other hand, many optometrists routinely include the tests and appreciate the need for early detection of glaucoma or the precursor, of same. This situation has led me to believe that the general public should have some knowledge of glaucoma to be in a position to ask for these tests. I know from my experiences that the level of knowledge about the blinding disease, glaucoma, in this country, is totally inadequate. I am deeply concerned about this.

I have also become aware of the fact that a number of ophthalmologists object to optometrists doing any tests apart from the prescription and dispensing of spectacles, a fact, I believe is shameful. I for my part strongly recommend everyone to see an optometrist for the simple reason that there is no waiting time, as is the case with ophthalmologists, and people can more or less walk in off the street to have their eyes examined. An optometrist has the expertise and the equipment necessary to detect abnormalities of your eyes. But the fact remains that not every optometrist includes ocular examination of the eyes.

These established facts fly in the face of statements made by Mr David Southgate, the Director of Professional Services for the Australian Optometrical Association (AOA), as follows:

“Testing for glaucoma is standard and routine in optometric practice... Tests done routinely on all patients aged 40 and over...”
Mr Southgate then goes on to say that:

“Optometrists have well-established moral and legal obligations to detect glaucoma (and other ocular diseases) and are acutely aware of the value of early detection.”

If that would be the case then the AOA should strongly enforce these moral and legal obligations upon each and every member of the Association to ensure that tests are carried out as stated. Up to this day I am unaware of any action being taken against the optometrist who failed to carry out the appropriate tests on me. This is despite the fact that the AOA was fully informed of the facts surrounding my case.

On the bright side I am pleased that, after trying to get some assistance from the AOA for the past two years, the association is offering some help. In a letter of the 21 November, 1988 I received a cheque for $500 to help with my campaign and it was indicated that further assistance may be made available in the future.

My sincere thanks for a step in the right direction.

No further assistance was offered or received.
Organisations for the Blind

I believe that all of us have probably been asked, at one time or another, to give money to train more guide dogs. Please consider this... with glaucoma representing about 20% of all blindness, would it not also make sense to stop the unnecessary loss of vision rather than only provide services for those people whose eyesight has been lost? Could their eyesight have been saved?

Please don’t get me wrong, one day I may need a guide dog myself, but I believe that there is a matter of priority and common sense to be considered.

We have in this country of ours many organisations catering for the needs of the blind and the visually impaired. And it is undeniable that a lot of hard work is done by many sincere volunteers. The State and Federal governments make millions of dollars available each year, plus a lot of money is given to these organisations by way of donations. So I ask myself why isn’t some of this money, made available for the prevention of blindness?

Sadly the fact remains that in Australia thousands of people have already lost their eyesight from glaucoma – a preventable blindness – and many thousands have had their eyesight impaired to the extent that they are unable to carry on their daily work. This is an intolerable situation. The direct cost to the Australian community runs into countless millions of dollars every year.

The pain and suffering caused cannot be counted in dollars and cents!

Have any of those service organisations made a decent effort to warn the general public of this insidious and preventable cause of blindness?

From my own experiences I believe they have not! Surely the administrators of those organisations, who have daily contact with the blind and vision impaired, must know all about glaucoma! Is there not a question of moral obligation towards the Australian public at large?

Next time you generously give your donation spare a thought for what purpose your money will be used.

Your best friends are your own, seeing eyes, not your own guide dog!
The Health Departments

What actions have been taken by the New South Wales and Victorian State government Departments of Health? Whose job it is to investigate health problems in the community. Have they been doing their job, or are they blissfully unaware on the topic of glaucoma? (I believe this to be the very same situation across Australia.)

In 1980 the Health Commission of New South Wales produced a pamphlet on glaucoma where they admitted that:

“In New South Wales, 40–50,000 middle-aged and older people have chronic glaucoma, some without being aware of it.”

Despite the Health Commission’s awareness of the immensity and seriousness of the problem, the above-mentioned leaflet went out of print in 1984 and to this very day has not been reprinted or replaced. All my requests for a reprint have fallen on deaf ears. Written and personal representations to the Minister for Health, Mr Anderson, have only resulted in a letter being sent to me by the NSW Department of Health (South West Region) on 12 May, 1987 in which the Health Education Officer, Noelle Oke, writes:

“I am most regretful that all my efforts to obtain funding for the glaucoma pamphlet have been to no avail. I have made both personal and written submissions on your behalf to the hospital, and the Regional Director, but unfortunately no funds are available to cover printing costs. The cost of doing so for 200,000 copies of the pamphlet would have been in the vicinity of $2000 to $4000, depending on the quality of paper and colour.”

What a small price to pay to stop someone from experiencing the misery and despair caused by a preventable blindness!

In the course of enquiries on the subject of glaucoma awareness with the NSW government, The Border Mail newspaper in Albury was told by the spokesman for the Minister of Health, Mr Wayne Geddes, that the Health Department had
adequately funded a glaucoma prevention program through NSW hospitals, and that the Department had provided $10,000 per year for the past ten years, for this purpose. Upon making further enquiries to hospitals in the region and other government funded health organisations it became obvious that no such funding had ever been received. This led me to make representations to the Minister for Health in NSW, Mr Peter Collins, through the Local Member for the Albury Electorate, Mr Ian Glachan. Despite his earnest efforts to get to the core of this matter no answers were forthcoming.

*The Border Mail* featured an article on this matter on 9 November, 1988. After an editorial, dated 30 August, 1988 brought the issue into the public eye.

The newspaper’s own research substantiated my claims that the Minister for Health and his department were displaying gross incompetence in this matter. The Minister for Health, Mr Peter Collins, refused to comment on the matter leaving it to his spokesman to represent him. If you read the article from *The Border Mail* you will clearly see that this man has attempted to mislead the public on this matter. It remains to be seen whether any funding was actually made available or if it has been misappropriated as the Minister has as yet not answered my questions which I outline below.

### Questions to the Minister

The following questions were put to the Minister of Health NSW, Peter Collins on 2 September 1988, on my behalf by Ian Glachan MP, Member for Albury:

- Please name the hospitals involved in the Glaucoma Prevention Program in NSW for the past 10 years?
• What are the names of the organisations receiving $10,000 per year over the past 10 years, a total of $100,000?
• For what purpose was the money provided?
• How many people in NSW suffer from glaucoma?
• How many people in NSW are blinded by glaucoma?
• How many people in NSW are treated in hospitals for glaucoma?
• What has the NSW Department of Health done over the past 10 years in regard to public awareness of glaucoma?

No answers to the above questions were forthcoming.

The situation in Victoria is somewhat similar in terms of the lack of effort being made to inform the general public about glaucoma. In a letter from the Victorian Minister for Health, Mr David White, to the Member for Mornington, Mr R. F. Cooper MLA, Mr White states:

“In the three years 1983–85 inclusive 2376 people were treated as inpatients for glaucoma in Victorian public hospitals.”

And:

“At the present time there appears to be little public education about the condition and I am informed that healthcare professionals would be happy to distribute a suitable leaflet on the subject if one was available. I have therefore asked the Health Promotion Unit of the Health Department of Victoria to consider producing a leaflet about glaucoma.”

This letter was written on 23 September, 1987 and to this day no such material has been neither produced nor distributed. I have come to the conclusion that if this is the way the people in power look after our welfare, then the whole of the Australian population is in big trouble!
Our Politicians

I would like to make a few points concerning the role our State and Federal politicians are playing in the quest for the awareness of glaucoma and its dire implications to the community, at large. Are they aware of the facts concerning the preventable blindness caused by this disease?

Do they realise the potentially devastating effects it has on the people they govern? I say they do, because I went to great lengths to inform many of them.

At the Federal level for example, the Minister for Health, Dr Neal Blewett, in a letter to Mr Tim Fischer MP, the Member for Farrer, states:

“Mr Kaiser is correct in stating that glaucoma (of the chronic, open angle variety) is the major cause of permanent visual impairment in a significant number of Australians, that it has an insidious onset and should be detected and treated at an early stage and that there needs to be a greater awareness of the problem generally.” (26/2/1987)

Despite further representations to Dr Blewett I am unaware of any actions being taken to stop more Australians falling victim to this preventable disease. Furthermore, a petition of 3000 signatures of concerned Australian citizens, collected by me, asking for action by the government on this issue has been ignored. I handed this petition in person to the office of Dr Blewett in Canberra in February of 1988 and I can only assume that it is collecting dust on a shelf or has found its way into a bin!

Is the NSW Minister for Health, Mr Peter Collins, a typical example of the people we put into government to look after our welfare? I am referring to the issues raised in the previous chapter where what seem to be blatant lies have been proffered as answers to my enquiries on the topic of glaucoma.

I ask you to compare the different attitudes towards glaucoma displayed by Mr Collins from statements he made before and after becoming the Minister for Health. In a letter to me as the Shadow Minister for Health Mr Collins writes:
“You have made remarkable progress in light of a total lack of interest from the Department of Health... I applaud your efforts and commend your endeavour to the people of NSW and thank you for keeping me informed on this important matter.” (22/10/87)

And in a further letter to Mr Ian Glachan, Liberal Candidate for Albury, he states:

“Thank you for bringing to my attention the excellent work of Mr Rolf Kaiser. His efforts in glaucoma education are well known to me and I share his amazement that the NSW Department of Health does not have a pamphlet on this most important issue... To prompt some action from the government, I am placing a question on the Parliamentary Notice Paper about the availability of literature for distribution about glaucoma.” (23/9/87)

Since that time, Mr Peter Collins has become the Minister for Health in NSW. Earlier this year his reply to a letter from me begging for funding of $15,000 for the continuation of the Glaucoma Awareness Campaign, I received the following reply:

“...whilst I am sympathetic to the type of campaign you are endeavouring to promote, I regret that funds are not available to assist you.” (20/7/1988)

The former Minister for Health in NSW, Mr Peter Anderson, completely ignored all my requests for action on this matter when he was in power.

I recall meeting with the minister on his visit to Albury. During said meeting I respectfully requested a reprint of an out-of-date glaucoma brochure. (See previous chapter: ‘The Health Departments’, for correspondence from the Health Education Officer, Noelle Oke.)

The Minister for Health in Victoria, Mr David White, having admitted to the seriousness of the situation and the lack of public education concerning glaucoma, has produced no tangible results. The people of Victoria are still not informed of how they can avoid blindness from glaucoma.

There is, however, one politician of note, and that is Mr Tim Fischer MP, the Member for Farrer. He has gone out on a limb on several occasions in an effort to get some answers to my questions. He is but one ‘goldfish’ in a pool of ‘sharks’!
The Glaucoma Foundation of Australia

In early 1986 I set out to bring to the attention of the Australian public the need for glaucoma testing in the hope that through my actions someone else would be spared the fate of losing their eyesight. By informing the community of the facts concerning this insidious disease people would not have to be caught unaware as I was, from my experiences. I felt compelled to improve the situation. I believe that I have civic and moral obligations to do everything in my power to prevent others from experiencing the distress I feel over what is a preventable disease.

Early in my campaign many articles about my efforts were printed in newspapers and magazines around Australia. This publicity resulted in invitations to talk about glaucoma on radio and television. I followed up all these requests for interviews and in early July of 1987, Channel 9 in Sydney contacted me to appear on the Ray Martin Midday Show. I was asked if I had any objections to ‘Dr James Wright’ being present during the interview. I was very pleased that a medical authority would be present to substantiate my claims and I sent the information requested of me to Channel 9 without hesitation.

Foundation Launched
On 23 August I launched the national Glaucoma Foundation of Australia with the aim of improving public awareness of glaucoma. I saw the proposed appearance on the Midday Show as a valuable opportunity to publicise the inception of the Foundation.
Shortly afterwards I was told by Channel 9 that ‘Dr James Wright’ would not be available for the programmed interview on the 2 September, and that the services of an eye specialist had been secured to take his place. These alternate arrangements still appealed to me and I arrived at the studios in Sydney where I was greeted by a show hostess who introduced me to a Dr Ivan Goldberg. Dr Goldberg, an ophthalmologist, would be present at the interview as the spokesman for the Royal College of Ophthalmology of Sydney.

Dr Goldberg and I spoke for about half an hour about glaucoma and the work I had done concerning my Glaucoma Awareness Campaign. During the course of this conversation the doctor produced some copies of newspaper articles reporting on my efforts including *The Border Mail* article of 23 August entitled; ‘Glaucoma Sufferer Launches Research Charity’.

*See Appendices: News Articles: Glaucoma sufferer launches research charity*

Prior to the interview I made an effort to have my name, address and telephone number displayed upon the screen during the program. I was informed by the show hostess that this was not possible. And yet, to my astonishment, I became aware of the following message being displayed on the screen during the interview:

> “Anybody interested in forming a glaucoma foundation should contact Mr Horrie Dargie or Frank Silk on telephone numbers – (04) 627 2704 – (02) 605 5061.” (Both being patients of Dr Goldberg!)

After the interview I expressed my concern over this matter as it seemed to me that my efforts to establish a Foundation were being subverted.

Dr Goldberg admitted to me that he had arranged for the telephone numbers to be displayed. At this point I realised that I could not trust Dr Goldberg. He was already aware that I had launched the Foundation and he was fully aware of my work and efforts over the past six months.

As it turned out my mistrust of Dr Goldberg and his motives were well founded.

Dr Goldberg committed this deplorable act as the spokesman for the Royal College of Ophthalmology and with their consent.

Dr Goldberg told me if I was interested he would arrange a meeting with these people the following day at the Royal College of Ophthalmology in Sydney.
At that time I agreed to his invitation as it seemed to me that if other people were already interested in setting up a Foundation for the promotion of glaucoma awareness that it would be sensible to combine our efforts.

At the meeting I again expressed my concern over the events of the previous day. Even at this early stage of proceedings it seemed that those present at the meeting were steering the emphasis of the discussion towards the raising of funds for research. In retrospect this is much clearer to see while at the time it was occurring I was more concerned with informing people about the prevention of unnecessary blindness. Now I am acutely aware of the fact that I was set up by Dr Goldberg who steered the formation of the Foundation in the direction of his own aims by surrounding himself with committee members of whom many, I suspect all, but myself, were his own patients.

I am aware of the accusations being made here and of the fact that by writing about these events I may face further hardship. You must understand however that for the sake of preventing further unnecessary blindness in this country I will continue to oppose and overcome any obstacles put in my path.

**Foundation Resignation**

I want to summarise some events, which occurred over the following months, which forced me to resign from the Foundation I began.

- At the first meeting of the formation of the Foundation I outlined my aims and the plans I had for an awareness campaign. I was told to continue preparations for this tour and to submit a letter to the committee outlining the assistance required. I was assured that there would be little difficulty in finding suitable sponsors due to the expertise in this area of Mr Frank Silk. Having sent a letter outlining my requirements for the tour I am still awaiting a reply! This was over two years ago.

- In early 1986 I established a very good contact with the Commonwealth Bank head office in Sydney. After several meetings with executives of the bank I was told that substantial help would be available as soon as an organisation such as the Foundation was formed. I brought this to the attention of the Steering Committee and was informed that they would follow this offer up. About four months later I became aware of the fact that Mr Frank Silk was an executive of the ANZ Banking Group Limited. This explains why the offer of sponsorship from the Commonwealth Bank was not pursued. This, in turn, cost me a great deal of financial hardship from which I have never recovered.
At the initial meeting of the Foundation on 2 September, 1986 a certain Mr Laurie Pincott was present. At the time I was informed that he was an observer only. However, since that time I have found out that this man is both the Executive Secretary of the Royal College of Ophthalmology and the Secretary of the Australian Foundation for Prevention of Blindness. If an organisation is already in existence that can achieve the aims of prevention of blindness why should someone involved in such an organisation be interested in the inception of another organisation whose aim is essentially the same? If I would have been aware of the existence of the Australian Foundation for Prevention of Blindness I would much rather have put my efforts behind them rather than go through all the effort of setting up another organisation with the same goals. Why would those who knew about this want to waste so much time, effort and money?

At the second meeting of the Foundation on 29 October, 1986 the Chairman, Mr Horrie Dargie:

‘...mentioned his willingness to assist the Foundation and the Committee in any way possible but felt that there may be someone on the Committee more suited, to the position of Chairman.’

After some discussion Mr Fred Luxton was elected as Chairman and yet this man had not even been elected as a member of the Committee. This in itself raises some serious doubts as to the manner in which proceedings at these meetings were carried out, not to mention the ethical questions that come to mind when you realise that Mr Luxton is another of the Committee who is a patient of Dr Goldberg’s.

At the third meeting of the Steering Committee of the National Glaucoma Foundation of Australia on the 3 December, 1986:

The Chairman expressed the view that it is now timely for media releases about glaucoma and the Foundation... After discussion, it was agreed that the Chairman should prepare releases, with Dr Goldberg, providing the necessary medical information, for approval by the Committee. However, at a later stage in the meeting it was agreed, but not by me, that the releases be sent to the media direct, without being seen first by the Committee, to save time on this occasion.

No such releases have been made to the media.
On 28 January, 1987 I had to make a conscious decision to resign from the Foundation. There were complex reasons for this, the main ones being:

- The going away from the original concept of the first meeting of the Foundation. I find it unbelievable that the Minutes of the first and second meetings have been disregarded.

- That in essence, the Committee wanted to effectively stop me from carrying on the work I started in April of 1986 that is, increasing the level of public awareness of glaucoma and carrying out an awareness campaign in the form of a tour around Australia.

It was quite a difficult decision to make, dissociating myself from an organisation of which I am the founder. However, I was compelled to resign because I felt that the original aims of the Foundation had been perverted through the actions of Dr Goldberg and what seems to be a conspiracy between this man and certain other members of the Committee.

I have included the Minutes of the first four meetings of the Foundation and the relevant correspondence in the Appendices. I ask you to judge for yourself whether my claims are justified.

At the time I started my glaucoma awareness campaign I believed, and still do, that immediate action should be taken to prevent further unnecessary blindness. It is of paramount importance to stop, by all available means, further misery caused by this disease. At the same time I agree that a properly organised and efficient organisation, such as the National Glaucoma Foundation could have been, is important for research, fundraising, liaison and coordination of efforts to prevent blindness. Yet it has taken what is now known as ‘Glaucoma Australia’ over 2½ years just to reach a point where they are contemplating going public.
At the time of writing this book I am unaware of any efforts being made by the Foundation to stop blindness caused by glaucoma by making the public aware of the disease. I firmly believe that with more sincerity on the part of all the people involved in the Glaucoma Foundation of Australia that the aims of setting up the Foundation and increasing public awareness could have been achieved equally successfully and without unnecessary delay.

**Meetings of the Foundation**
Special attention should be given to the Minutes of meetings of the Foundation.

It will become clear to you that the whole set up is just a farce. You the reader will realise that people who were not even on the Committee, like Mr Fred Luxton, become Chairman, Mr L. J. Jennings is permitted to second a motion as an observer and to top it all off becomes one of the signatories of the Foundation’s bank accounts!

You also will notice how my original aims were perverted.

The rest I leave to your own imagination.

*See Appendices:* Meeting Minutes and Foundation Resignation
Professor Ivan Goldberg AM


Published by the Glaucoma Foundation of America, 9 January 2014:

Professor Ivan Goldberg Named Recipient of The Glaucoma Foundation’s 2013 Robert Ritch Award
January 9, 2014

The Glaucoma Foundation (TGF) presented its 2013 Robert Ritch Award for Excellence and Innovation in Glaucoma to Professor Ivan Goldberg, AM, MBBS, FRANZCO, FRACS of Sydney, Australia, a noted international figure in the glaucoma community. Announcement and presentation was made at TGF’s December 3rd Annual Benefit Ball in New York City.

The award recognizes the contributions of individuals who have played a significant and unique role in promoting the medicine and science of glaucoma. It is named in honor of Dr. Robert Ritch, founder of TGF and its Medical Director, who received the inaugural award in 2008. Other winners have been Dr. Paul L. Kaufman (2009),

Professor Goldberg Exposed
We may never know if any people may have lost their precious eyesight, caused by the two-and-a-half years delay, before Dr Goldberg announced the inception of ‘Glaucoma Australia’ Inc. in 1988. Dr Goldberg deceitfully ignored the establishment of the National Glaucoma Foundation of Australia, back in 1986! Dr Ivan Goldberg and the Royal College of Ophthalmology, deserve the strongest condemnation from every fair-minded person. The dishonesty and falsehood of Professor Ivan Goldberg is herewith revealed!

Professor Ivan Goldberg stands accused of receiving the Order of Australia, AM by deception, falsely claiming to be the founder of the ‘National Glaucoma Foundation of Australia’ now known as, ‘Glaucoma Australia’.
An incomprehensible untruth!

I don’t know who Kathleen Holmes is, but her claim to be the co-founder of the Foundation is utterly outrageous!

The question arises, is or was Kathleen Holmes also a patient of Professor Ivan Goldberg?

In the Minutes of 3 December 1986, being the third meeting of the Foundation, is in fact the first time Miss K. Holmes name appears as an observer!

Furthermore, the Minutes dated 28 January 1987 reveal that at the very same meeting K Holmes was nominated and accepted the position as secretary to...

the National Glaucoma Foundation of Australia!

I accuse Kathleen Holmes of dishonesty!

Further I accuse Kathleen Holmes of receiving the Order of Australia by deception!
Thesis assesses suppression and lack of awareness
An essay provides irrefutable evidence of Professor Goldberg's shameful, unethical, and deplorable manipulation. Manipulation aimed to gain kudos and total control.

Excerpt of Essay: Science and Society, HUS408:

Rather than directly tackle one of the essay questions provided for the topic ‘Suppression in Science’, I have decided to attempt the establishment of a case not previously documented. The case involves, what I will argue to be the suppression of, a lay individual attempting to influence the activities of the modern scientific medical establishment in Australia. Within this paper my aims are as follows:

• the establishment of the plausibility of a particular suppression case,
• to situate that case within a broader theoretical perspective,
• to assess some of the strengths and weaknesses of the particular approaches adopted in achieving these former aims, and

The Border Mail, 6 April 1991
the provision of perspectives on the issues involved in the case for the purpose of stimulating further critical research and comment.

Having established that interests have been threatened, it is now necessary to consider in what ways Rolf Kaiser’s case meets the second criterion of Martin’s et al. concept of suppression. That is, in what ways was Rolf Kaiser penalised for or prevented from carrying out his activities concerning the secondary prevention of Chronic Glaucoma, and by whom? Before proceeding I must point out that there are many aspects of this case that are worthy of comment. In the interests of academic rigour however, I have decided to deal only with issues for which I am able to substantiate my views with recorded evidence. Accordingly, the following analysis will deal chiefly with the first and third aspects of the case outlined in connection with the satisfaction of the first criterion of Martin’s et al. concept of suppression. Aspects of the case that will not be dealt with here, but do have direct bearing on the issues, include the withdrawal of pledged funding and support to Rolf Kaiser; threats of legal action against him by certain participants in the debates; the denial of funding from the N.S.W. and Federal Governments; the shelving of a 3000 signatory petition on the issue of screening by the Federal Government; and the receipt of anonymous phone calls by Rolf Kaiser in which threats have been made upon his life.

For full essay see Appendices: E. Kaiser Thesis Paper
Australia Turns a ‘Blind Eye’

I ask you to consider the following statements made by Professor Frank A. Billson, Professor of Clinical Ophthalmology with the Save Sight and Eye Health Institute.

Quote from their first annual report in 1986–87:

“40 million or more than one per cent of the world’s population are blind and blindness ranks with cancer as the two most feared afflictions in the community which threaten health and lifestyle.”

“Glaucoma represents 20% of world blindness and it affects about 1½% of people over 40 of whom about 20% have a family history of the problem.”

The World Health Organisation in a survey on world blindness could obtain no statistics for Australia in 1977 and my enquiries towards the end of the 1980s have encountered a similar dearth of information. This leads me to the necessity of extrapolating available world statistics to the population of Australia, to obtain a picture of how blindness affects us as a community. Given that one per cent of the world’s population is blind, equals a potential figure of 160,000 blind and vision impaired persons in Australia. Further, given that 20% of those blinded, are glaucoma sufferers, potential means, 32,000 people in Australia have lost their eyesight from this preventable cause of blindness.

I am fully aware that these figures are at best rough estimates. They are, however, the only ones to work with because no accurate and comprehensive statistics exist in Australia on blindness and its causes. Therefore, I have included the following quotations, which may convince the reader of the potential severity of the present situation:

“Glaucoma is responsible for 13% of those on the blind register in England and Wales. It is the leading cause of preventable blindness. It is intolerable that more is not being done, because this blindness could, in most cases, have been prevented by early detection and good treatment.” (International Glaucoma Association, England, 1985)
“Of 35,931 people screened (for glaucoma) at 19 Health Fairs in America, 5.2% showed abnormal results.” (Berwick, D. M., Journal American Medical Association, Vol. 254, No. 11, p.1493)

“In the three years 1983–85 inclusive 2376 people were treated as inpatients for glaucoma in Victorian public hospitals...” (Letter from David White, Victorian Minister for Health to Mr Robin Cooper MP, 23 September, 1987)

“Approximately two persons in one hundred develop the more common chronic condition (of glaucoma) after early middle age. In New South Wales, 40–50,000 middle-aged and older people have chronic glaucoma, some without being aware of it.” (Health Commission of NSW pamphlet entitled Glaucoma; Division of Health Promotion, ISBN O 7240 3048 4)

Given these facts and the existence of glaucoma organisations in countries such as England, the United States of America and many European nations, why is it that governmental and medical authorities in Australia are doing so little to alleviate the problem? One can only speculate about this, however, my experiences over the past three years have shown that glaucoma and blindness is not solely a medical issue but also a political one.

There exists in Australia a huge industry catering for the needs of the blind and visually impaired members of our community. Those organisations involved have multi-million-dollar budgets with Directors, Managers and Secretaries, many of whom seem to have a greater passion for the love of money rather than worrying about welfare of their fellow Australians. Could it be that a 20% reduction of blindness would mean 20% less business?

I believe the time has come for all ‘fair-dinkum’ people in this country to ask themselves some serious questions, and demand to be told the truth from the people involved in this serious issue, like the medical profession, politicians, health service organisations, and Associations for the Blind and Visually Impaired.
The Lions Clubs

The Lions Clubs have been well aware of glaucoma and its implications for at least 10 years, yet they have only made a token effort towards educating their fellow countrymen about the dangers.

Professor F. A. Billson, Director of the Save Sight and Eye Health Institute, which is a project of the NSW and ACT Lions Clubs, appointed me as the Liaison Officer to the Institute. This announcement was made in a documentary on preventable blindness, produced by SBS Television, Sydney.

In said documentary Mr Billson had this to say:

“Mr. Kaiser is a remarkable man; he used his own initiative and resources to bring to the Australian public, awareness of the disease, glaucoma, which is still not fully understood. He is the first individual who took it upon himself by starting a national awareness campaign.” (Vox Populi, Episode 39, 1987, SBS Television)

(Later), at a meeting of the Save Sight and Eye Health Institute on the 28 September, 1987, I was appointed as a’ Honorary Director’ of the ‘Glaucoma Awareness Campaign’. I was promised by members of the Institute that the expenses of my tour around Australia would be met to the tune of $100 per day. I was delighted and I wrote to the Director of the Institute expressing my sincere thanks.

See Appendices: Correspondence: Letter to Professor Billson

In return we agreed that my glaucoma booklet (Glaucoma, IT CAN SEND YOU BLIND) was to be published by the University Printer and the proceeds from its sale go to the Save Sight Institute. Further, I provided the proceeds from sales of an eye drop dispenser, to benefit the institute as well.
For reasons unknown to me, and which one can only speculate about, my relationship with the Institute suddenly turned sour. Mr Ted Wilson, the Chairman of the Save Sight and Eye Health Institute, for reasons unbeknown by me, subsequently opposed my appointments by Professor Billson. He admitted responsibility for the stoppage of the printing of the second edition, which was to be undertaken by the printer at the University of Sydney, on behalf and benefit of the Institute.

At a meeting with Mr Wilson in Sydney on 27 February, 1988 I was personally informed of these matters and told that the issue would be brought up at a meeting of the Lions Club in March of 1988, and that I would be informed immediately of the outcome. During this time my proposed awareness campaign tour was being prepared but was severely stifled due to lack of funds and the holding back of promised aid.

In May of 1988, I called Mr Ted Wilson asking him why I had not received any notice of the outcome of the meeting of the Lions Club at which my appointments and awareness campaign would be discussed. He expressed his surprise that I had not received a letter on the matter, but shortly afterwards I received the following:

“... Cease any further preparation of a Glaucoma Awareness Program under the name of the Institute... In the meantime I request that you refrain from identifying yourself in any way with Lions Clubs NSW – ACT, Save Sight Foundation and the Save Sight and Eye Health Institute, in accordance with our previous requests and particularly cease using the Institute letterheads. The matter will be raised at the next meeting of the Save Sight and Eye Health Foundation on the 8 July.” (17/6/1988)

I have still not been informed of the reasons for the Institute’s turnaround in its attitude towards me and my awareness campaign. In fact, in response to letters I have written in attempts to gather such information, I have been threatened with legal and police action. Only one thing is clear and that is that the powers that be in the network of organisations associated with the Save Sight and Eye Health Institute no longer want anything to do with me.

Internal struggles for power and kudos and inherent conflicts of interest are directly responsible for some of the blindness and suffering of our fellow citizens. The people involved in these organisations should wake up to themselves and realise that with a bit of cooperation the aims and objectives of all sincere efforts towards helping our fellow man could be achieved.
At the time I started my awareness campaign I was acutely aware of my limited resources, but it was, and still is, my belief that if you want to do something, you have to be willing to back your actions with everything you’ve got.

Towards the end of 1986, having utilised all my available resources, I wrote to about 50 of the largest companies in Australia explaining what I had done and was intending to do, informing them of the facts surrounding glaucoma and its effects on the individual sufferer and the Australian community at large.

I asked these companies for sponsorship of my proposed car and caravan tour of Australia, to promote public awareness of glaucoma. In my letters I offered these companies full acknowledgement of their sponsorship in media releases, details on the car and caravan to be used and accreditation for the help in my book. I hoped that these incentives, along with some sense of civic and moral duty, might entice some companies to help me with such things as petrol, equipment and money necessary for my tour.

The answers were basically all the same, for example:

“We congratulate you on your effort of bringing to the attention of the public the danger of glaucoma but unfortunately at the moment we don’t have the resources to assist you, and besides we already give generously to established charities.”

To spare embarrassment I refrain from naming and shaming.

In desperation I also wrote to the Prime Minister, Mr Bob Hawke, begging the man for some help in my quest to prevent unnecessary blindness.

But my plea to the person who leads the Australian nation was completely ignored. I did not even receive a reply.

I then decided to write to his wife, Hazel Hawke, and I received the following reply:
“In order to avoid the necessity for discrimination on the grounds of worth, she is compelled to restrict her contributions to individuals and groups that she has supported over the years.” (From Sharon Massey, Personal Secretary to Hazel Hawke dated 6/2/1987)

As you can imagine I was most disappointed to receive such little encouragement and no tangible aid. However, even more disappointing was the lack of response from those companies in the pharmaceutical industry who actually stand to gain substantial benefit from an increased detection and treatment of glaucoma. One such company, Allergan Pharmaceuticals Pty. Ltd., which supplies medications to the medical profession and chemists for use in the treatment of glaucoma, had this to say in their reply to my request for sponsorship:

“...it is with regret that I must inform you that we are unable to be of any assistance to you. However, as you are probably aware, Allergan research expenditure into glaucoma now totals several million dollars and our investment of research funds is continuing.” (29/1/1987)

It is all very well to provide millions of dollars for research but why isn’t there one cent available to stop the unnecessary blindness in this country?

Another company I approached, namely OPSM, who actually have a Research and Charitable Foundation which, one would think, would be more than willing to support a worthwhile cause such as mine, had this to say in their letter of reply:

“I regret to advise that your application for a grant from the Foundation has been unsuccessful... I am afraid that I am not at liberty to disclose any specific reasons given by members of the Research Committee for rejecting your application.” (Letter from P. J. Moloney, Secretary and Executive Officer, OPSM Research and Charitable Foundation Ltd. (30/10/1986)

I know now that the Glaucoma Foundation of Australia is sponsored by OPSM. May the reason be that Mr Laurie Pincott, who is involved with the Foundation, is also the Executive Secretary of the Royal College of Ophthalmologists, the Secretary of the Australian Foundation for the Prevention of Blindness (which is run by the Royal College of Ophthalmologists), and sits on the Research Committee of the OPSM Research and Charitable Foundation Limited?

It is little wonder that I did not receive any funding from the OPSM. Is there a conflict of interest here, somewhere, when one individual is involved in so many organisations, supposedly, attempting to achieve different aims?
Over the past 18 months I have made numerous telephone calls to the ABC Television studios in both Melbourne and Sydney in an attempt to gain an expression of interest in the facts surrounding glaucoma. The main purpose, as with all my activities in this field, was to publicise glaucoma and thereby help to prevent unnecessary blindness and suffering. All my approaches to the ABC have been to no avail.

Towards the end of 1987 I personally visited the ABC's Gore Hill studios in Sydney and asked to see a representative from the 7.30 Report program. At that meeting I handed over extensive literature and indisputable facts concerning glaucoma. At the same meeting, I showed the researcher who spoke to me, letters from national and international bodies substantiating my information. I was told that I would be contacted on this matter, but I was not.

On 9 May, 1988 I got in contact with another researcher from the same program, a woman named Karen Smith, who listened to me patiently on the telephone concerning the entire matter and she told me she would discuss it with the Producer of the program. On the same day, at about 5.30pm Karen Smith phoned and told me that the 7.30 Report wanted to investigate the issue of glaucoma and also some matters concerning events that had occurred with the National Glaucoma Foundation of Australia and the State and Federal governments and my awareness campaign. The following day (16/5/88) Karen Smith phoned me and made an appointment for a film crew and reporter to see me at 9.30am the following day. However, at 7.25pm that night Karen phoned again and told me that the meeting for the following morning was cancelled and that the 7.30 Report no longer wanted to pursue the matter. No reasons were given for this action.

The next morning I decided to visit the ABC studios in an effort to get some explanation for the events of the previous day. I arrived at 10.45am and asked to see Karen Smith but was told she had the day off and would not be at the studios. I then asked to see someone else connected with the 7.30 Report, preferably the Producer. I was told by the receptionist that no-one was available or willing
to talk to me. My reaction at that time was to stay at the reception desk until somebody was available to talk to me and I informed the receptionist of this decision. Soon afterwards I was approached by a security guard and requested to leave the premises. Further, I was informed that if I did not leave voluntarily the police would be called in to remove me.

The reason for my actions at that time is that I believe the ABC has a moral obligation to investigate an issue that affects the welfare of so many thousands of Australians. The ABC is funded by the public and it should serve the needs of those people. My actions were also a result of my knowledge of other incidents where issues relating to eye diseases had been treated with a complete lack of interest on the ABC’s part. I refer here to the cancelling of a film about Aboriginal blindness by the ABC, which was made by F. Hollows, Professor of Ophthalmology, because it was felt it might damage the tourist trade in the Northern Territory. (Source: Robyn Davidson in *Tracks*, Paladin Grafton Books, 1982)

I also refer to a 26-minute program titled *Seeing into the Future*, which was produced by the University of Sydney Television Services, to be screened on ABC’s *Quantum* program in 1987. This film dealt with a number of eye diseases common to Australia, including a segment on glaucoma. I myself was featured in said segment dealing with glaucoma. But because I mentioned that in fact Australia was lagging behind the rest of the western world, by about 10 to 15 years, on the matter of glaucoma awareness, the documentary was never screened!

Approaches to other ABC programs such as *Quantum*, *Four Corners*, *The Investigators* and ABC News were also ignored. I ask you to come to your own conclusions of what is important to the ABC and how public monies are spent.

Why should they ignore publicity of an issue like glaucoma, which could only benefit the Australian community?

See Appendices: TV Media: Documentary: *Seeing into the Future*
I cannot omit from this book a short discussion of the disease trachoma which is also a potentially blinding ailment. Such a large number of people I have spoken to confuse trachoma with glaucoma that it must be made clear that they are two distinctly separate eye diseases.

Trachoma is a chronic form of conjunctivitis, caused mainly, by vitamin deficiency, low standards of hygiene, due largely to the lack of, access to clean running water! It is prevalent among people living in isolated and arid areas. Our Aboriginal people in Australia are paying a very high price in the form of suffering, caused by preventable blindness. In fact Australia has:

“...the worst ethnic blindness rate in the world.” (Source: Robyn Davidson in Tracks, Paladin Grafton Books, 1982)

Many people believe that trachoma only affects our indigenous population but this is also incorrect. Trachoma and glaucoma can affect anybody.

Recently I received a letter from the Managing Director of Christian Blind Mission International based in Melbourne. In it they ask for donations to help prevent people going blind from trachoma using East Africa as an example of a country where help is needed. I was deeply offended to read this letter because it contained absolutely no reference to the plight of Australia’s indigenous people, let alone any reference to other forms of preventable blindness such as glaucoma.

I ask you: why is all the help and money being directed overseas when there is so much to be done in our own country? Please don’t misunderstand my intentions. If I could help it, no person in the world would suffer from unnecessary blindness, but I believe that we all should make the eradication of preventable blindness in this country our foremost goal. Including all members of our community, black, white, or any other colour! Don’t you agree?
In December of 1988 two articles about glaucoma were featured in a magazine titled *Eye Care Australia*, a national news magazine for eye care professionals and their staff. I believe that some matters in these articles need to be clarified.

**ARTICLE 1:**

*Exposure for the battler with a cause*

While it is true that I have spent my life savings on the cause of trying to prevent blindness from glaucoma in Australia, it is incorrectly stated that I “risked my house”. The premises in which I dwell are only rented from the Housing Commission. If this would not be the case, I am as sure as hell I would have sold the place and used the money, rather than make all these futile efforts for funding the campaign, by begging for assistance.

In the case of the mixed reactions by the State and Federal health departments and various professional associations, I would like to say that it is typical of these bodies to object to the fact that an individual, from outside the medical profession, is trying to rectify what he sees as an intolerable situation.

An individual who has taken positive steps in the direction that should have been taken a long time ago. It is hardly surprising considering the apathy they have displayed in this issue despite the fact that they are well aware of the facts surrounding glaucoma.
In regard to the economic argument that the disease must be seen in the context of community and funding priorities, my argument is that it costs Australian taxpayers an estimated 40 million dollars per year on pension payments to the victims of glaucoma, so what economic sense lies there, by not funding a prevention program?

It is a well-established fact that about 90% of this blindness could have been prevented by spending a fraction of the 40 million dollars on preventive measures.

The NSW Minister for Health, Mr Peter Collins, did not even think it made sense to spend $15,000 in an effort that could potentially save millions of dollars.

On a more personal level consider this: What do you tell a person who is going blind from glaucoma? A person, who was unaware of the fact, that his or her blindness could have been prevented, simply by being made aware of this disease. I think it would be very callous to tell that person, “It did not make economic sense”!

Don’t forget that this person could one day be You!

At this point I would like to challenge a statement made by Mr Chackman, Executive Director of the Australian Optometrical Association. He says:

“In Britain Glaucoma testing is not compulsory as far as I know”.

This is not so. Let me quote from the Spring 1986 Newsletter of the International Glaucoma Association in which the Chairman, Mr R. Pitts Crick states:

“The optician is already required to examine a patient’s eyes with the ophthalmoscope...”

And from a letter from this man to me in February of 1988:

“...but a mandatory part of the test has been opthalmoscopy, to view the interior of the eye for the detection of abnormalities.”

In short, testing for glaucoma is a compulsory part of all routine eye examinations in England. In the article Mr Chackman also says that:

“The situation is the same as it is here. It is done when it is needed.”
In at least one situation, my own case, it was not done when needed and I am aware of many other individuals who could say the same thing! Surely, if I as a non-professional can find out what is going on in other countries as far as prevention of blindness from glaucoma is concerned, Australian professionals in charge of our eye care should also be fully informed!

See Appendices: News Articles: Exposure for the battler with a cause

ARTICLE 2:

Govt backflips on glaucoma funds

As far as the NSW Minister for Health, Peter Collins, is concerned, it has been clearly shown in this book that the Minister is responsible for trying to mislead the people of NSW on the issue of glaucoma. The Minister has been made fully aware of the catastrophic results that glaucoma has on the individual and the community at large if they are left in ignorance of the disease. Instead of positive action, this knowledge has only resulted in the Minister and his department attempting to hoodwink the people of NSW by claiming that glaucoma is well under control and that glaucoma awareness programs have been conducted by the public hospitals for the past ten years to the tune of $100,000.

At first I believed that Mr Collins’ unwillingness to assist in this cause was due to a lack of knowledge about glaucoma but now I know that it is due to a total lack of compassion by the Minister whose job it is to look after the welfare of the people of NSW.

I call now for the resignation of the Minister for Health of NSW, Peter Collins, on the grounds of misleading the public of NSW on the matter of State funding of glaucoma awareness programs. As the head of the Health Department he must take full responsibility for the outrageous statements made by his spokesman Wayne Geddes. Mr Geddes has smeared my character by saying that I was
under investigation by lawyers from the University of Sydney, and by doing so, implying that I am involved in some criminal fraud. Did Mr Geddes make this extraordinary claim with the knowledge and consent of the Minister? Whatever the case, Peter Collins as the Minister for Health, must take the only available course of action and tender his resignation.

See Appendices: News Articles: Govt backflips on glaucoma funds
Conclusion

In this country of ours there exists an intolerable lack of awareness about glaucoma, which can at best be described as shameful. It is practically ignored by the medical profession, exploited, used as a cash-cow by organisations with vested interests, shrugged off by our politicians and rejected by the general public, in disbelief. And yet the facts contained in this book are indisputable.

The sad fact is that people in Australia are still losing their eyesight to an almost totally preventable disease. This is not befitting of a civilised nation and I believe that the people responsible for our health and welfare deserve the strongest criticism for allowing this situation to continue through their apathy and inaction. None of the allegations I have made in this book are unfounded, nor are they based on personal grievances. Every page of this book is written in concern for the welfare of every member of our community.

Remember that I myself unknowingly became a victim of glaucoma. All my efforts since then have been directed towards preventing this happening to others. I feel that by drawing attention to the issues I have raised in this book, I am doing everything in my power to achieve this aim. I do not have the financial resources or the support of the people that are in positions of responsibility to help me. And unlike many people, I feel a great sense of urgency about informing people about glaucoma because from my own experience I understand what it means to be going blind.

I sincerely hope, that after having read my book, you must admit that there are some serious matters that have to be dealt with. By pursuing my aims I have opened a proverbial ‘can of worms’ but I believe this to be the only way!

All the issues I have discussed can only be resolved, through a public inquiry into glaucoma, and blindness in general. The results of such an inquiry can only be beneficial for the entire community, as it will provide an arena in which controversial matters can be discussed and appropriate courses of action delineated.

It is only when the public is fully aware of the facts surrounding glaucoma, that the prevention of unnecessary blindness in Australia, will be achieved.
Postscript

July 2018

Thirty plus years have passed since I wrote my booklet: *Glaucoma, IT CAN SEND YOU BLIND*.

My book, *My Fight For Sight*, is based upon true, documented information and recorded events, collected over the past 30 years.

New information and statistics are still unavailable to truly understand the dire and sad situation concerning blindness from glaucoma in Australia. **30 years on!**

In 1986 the available statistics suggested about **200,000** Australians suffered from glaucoma.

In **2017** medical authorities in Australia put the figure at **300,000**!

Medical evidence supports that in fact 20% of those with a family history of glaucoma are at **high risk** of losing their precious eyesight!

My booklet, *Glaucoma, IT CAN SEND YOU BLIND*, is no longer for sale. All monies from booklet sales and donations collected are duly accounted for and were handed-over to the ‘National Glaucoma Foundation of Australia’, now known as ‘Glaucoma Australia’.

New and better medication is now available, dramatically improving a more positive outcome for anyone diagnosed with glaucoma!

But sadly, Australia still lags behind the rest of the civilised world, by about 10 to 15 years, in preventing blindness from glaucoma through **awareness**!

My booklet is now available free of charge from my website at [myfightforsight.com](http://myfightforsight.com)

I will bring the issues raised in my book to the attention of our local, state and federal members of parliament, requesting their support for a public inquiry.

Rolf Kaiser
July, 2018
Postscript

September 2020
The time has come, to inform readers about certain developments which have occurred since publishing my eBook on the internet in 2018.

I drew the attention of Mr David Andrews, the Chief Executive Officer of RANZCO* to the unethical behaviour of professor Ivan Goldberg AM, referring to the chapter in my eBook, which does support my allegations that, Professor Goldberg, is indeed a dishonest person, a Plagiarist.

I followed this up, by informing Mr Andrews about several Ophthalmologists, I accuse of breaching the code of conduct/ethics. One of them stands accused of the criminal act, of perverting the course of justice, by providing a knowingly false statutory declaration into court evidence.

The ‘GENTLEMEN’ referred to are:

- Professor Ivan Goldberg AM
- Dr. Heery, Ophthalmologist of Albury
- Dr. James La Nauze, Ophthalmologist, Melbourne, previously from Albury
- Dr Michael Delaney, Ophthalmologist, Sydney
- Mr Laurie Pincott, previously the Chief Executive Officer of the Royal College of Ophthalmologists

In spite of the most serious allegations, indisputably documented in my eBook, the Chief Executive Officer of RANZCO, had this to say:

Dear Mr Kaiser,

I acknowledge receipt of your email but I will not be doing anything with this as you have not sought any specific action.

Yours sincerely,
David Andrews
28 February, 2020
Given the seriousness of my allegations, I sincerely believe that the onus is on the Chief Executive to investigate allegations, such as breaches of the code of ethics and/or standards, without my prompting! Furthermore, given the high profile of the accused persons, would it be too far fetched to entertain the thought, that the attempt upon my life was indeed financed/sanctioned, by anyone of the accused persons, as an individual? Conspiring with others? Or perhaps even by the Royal College itself?

Furthermore, would the high profile of the accused persons explain the fact that the Albury Police Command is actively hushing-up an attempted Murder?

Rolf Kaiser
10 September, 2020

* The Royal Australian and New Zealand College of Ophthalmologists