

HOW UNIMAGINATIVE WAS MY VALLEY? AN EXAMINATION OF THE LOT STARTING WITH THIS RESPONSE TO THE NATIONAL INQUIRY INTO SEXUAL HARASSMENT IN AUSTRALIAN WORKPLACES. BABY, SAY NO AND LEARN WITH OTHERS TO AVOID IT IN MARRIAGE?

CONSIDER THIS SUBMISSION AS A MORE SENSIBLE REGIONAL ALTERNATIVE TO ANY COMPETITIVE NEUTRALITY INQUIRY. I DON'T GO INTO THIS MUCH HERE. SEE MORE AT www.Carolodonnell.com.au UNDER THE HERITAGE WAY SIDE BAR UNDER THE HEADING, ART AND LIFE

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

THE NATURE AND PREVALENCE OF SEXUAL HARASSMENT IN AUSTRALIAN WORKPLACES

Background and Findings

This submission to the **national Inquiry into Sexual Harassment in Australian workplaces** deals with the terms of reference relating to **the current legal framework** with respect to sexual harassment and also with its **drivers**, comparatively well-known or unknown, powerful or not. It is also made in related contexts of Department of Communication and the Arts investigation to the **Inquiry into the Competitive Neutrality of the National Broadcasters**. This is to consider how the national broadcasters operate in modern media contexts and whether the ways they compete with the private sector are appropriate.

This submission to both inquiries is thus first made in the context of the ***application of competitive neutrality principles to the business and activities of the ABC and SBS including in operational decision making and risk management***. It also deals with the ***cost structures of business activities*** and recommends more openly coordinated regional service cooperation as discussed in the files attached and starting with the regional construction and dissemination of books, pictures and their related filmed communications in land and housing situations. One speaks against the professionally closed and driven approaches. Public and private sector partnerships with the community are wasted in not opening up for related development and learning in better regional approaches to jobs addressed here.

One's related argument is that the inquiry model of investigation is more broadly consistent with the operational requirements of democracy than are law courts. The more broadly open the service operation the more broadly it may develop as better evidence based. This is the way to run a society to get the best out of it, instead of yet more mutual adversarial bamboozling. These regional service alternatives are therefore explored later, with IT found driving and wanting. This is also discussed in a practical contract light to make more movies better and to provide interesting career paths or contracts in many more regional arenas. A related draft regional film contract is tendered at the end for your related advice and support. A film on **The Art of the Girls in Tin Sheds** is proposed and already in production.

Under Section 116: Commonwealth not to legislate in respect of religion the Constitution states:

The Commonwealth shall not make any law for establishing any religion, or for imposing any religious observance, or for prohibiting the free exercise of any religion, and no religious test should be required as a qualification for any office or public trust under the Commonwealth.

The above seems a clear and reasonable statement, for a start. I write in conformity with it. The related submission attached on religion, human rights and film industry development was made in response to PM Turnbull's expert panel of lawyers considering **'the intersections between the enjoyment of the freedom of religion and other human rights'**.

The daily personal connexion and findings (In bed for longer with Fairfax in retirement)

I speak literally as a woman who men have ruined for polite society. (No kidding.) Cue the picture of the woman holding out the baby to the Pre-Raphaelite painter and viewer for inspection and accusation. Say sorry for your loss and move on in broader film production. See the **Art of the Girls in Tin Sheds** in related discussion and contract later. Will you kick into the tin too for Brett Doran a Maroubra boy who could lose some weight? (You should.)

This submission deals with the current legal framework with respect to sexual harassment and finds that under it the nature and prevalence of sexual harassment in Australian workplaces are impossible to determine and a poor way of addressing any alleged injury. It therefore recommends the open encouragement of speech and writing early in any such situation of encounter to avoid the common community irrationality in bearing the costs of lawyers. The moral superiority of the 4th estate is contrasted with the legal word monopoly in welcoming comment from all directions on behalf of the Australian people.

Try speaking and writing and be amazed how far you get without lawyers, especially with words, pictures and music with more effectively open and cooperative product storage. The film in production titled 'The Art of the Girls in Tin Sheds' is an example given later. However, I also speak as a woman who in youth was loath to give up the typewriter until I discovered the gigantic possibilities of Microsoft Office, email and Google for advance. My staff had to hide my typewriter from me forever to force me to a new computer class. I find myself old today and unable to go far without Brett Doran. (Kick in the tin for him.)

Helen McCabe's launch of **Future Women**, in Nine Entertainment's digital content direction in regard to **publishing, events and community**, is briefly referred to here, for example in the related context of the **Inquiry into the Competitive Neutrality of National Broadcasters**. McCabe is Nine Entertainment's digital content director, with an interest already in Nine's offering under the digital network **9Honey**, which looks after middle Australian 25-54 grocery buyers with children, according to *'McCabe readies Future Women'* in the Australian Financial Review (AFR 16.7.2018, p. 28, discussed again later). What would we do without the AFR and the Sydney Morning Herald, for example? Last week was the first time I ever knew clearly where Sydney buses run, which had been going on for a long time. I cut it out.

THE DEFINITION OF SEXUAL HARASSMENT AND RELATED LEGAL MATTERS

The legal definition of sexual harassment states it is '*an unwelcome sexual advance, unwelcome request for sexual favours or other conduct of a sexual nature which makes a person feel offended, humiliated and/or intimidated, where a reasonable person would anticipate that reaction in the circumstances*'. Nobody needs to be a lawyer to judge this. They just need information which they don't have, often because lawyers have kept it from them to continue with their normal expensive business of keeping us all in the dark more broadly and for longer. People who want their situations judged intelligently – and don't we all – should learn to speak up early and often publicly on their honest thoughts and desires.

Yet championing confusing words or secrecy, which is ignorance under another name, is also lawyer's meat and drink. The commercial, parliamentary or bureaucratic interpretation of language in law can only be touched by lawyers and by judges who were lawyers. Lawyers in post war Australia also swarmed into parliaments via their close family, school and other party associations, ruled by money and numbers in related interest groups. Our being normally determines our consciousness. Lawyers think like lawyers. My life's experience has rendered me cynical that these people will ever be capable of judging in other than feudal terms, where the feudal rights of the controlling male remain secret and paramount. The Republican debate seemed run as just a condescending game for kids. If related lawyers are really running the entire Oz gig, pretending their legally channelled responses are identical with the social interest, the only response is God save us.

In this feudal context, many of the concerns in any sexual harassment debate have always seemed to me to be small but expensive beer, to say the least. We want women at work to be able to look after themselves by speaking up because they need to look after many less powerful clients than themselves, including children. We don't want dummies. Women must learn to speak up better.

The effect of lawyers control of speech in parliament, government bureaucracy, the parliamentary party and in other association in the wider society is to expensively undermine the responsibility for autonomously informed moral judgment making and response in regard to any matter. In this context, free to air ABC and SBC TV and other national quality media appear as vital countervailing forces for more broadly honest and reliable understanding about the social environment. This national media spine based on intelligent news has already been destroyed by forces in America, for example – the homeland of sexual harassment as well as the black lives matter movement. If black lives mattered to black men they wouldn't have so many kids and not care where they ended. The main issue is not whether one's ego is wounded by speech in any healthy, vibrant, learning society. One ideally gives reasons for thoughts, in the search for broader evidence and clearer judgment about any troubling matter, not just about sexual harassment as defined by oneself.

To speak one's mind in apparent circumstances of oppression is a common duty which is made easier for some than others. To defer to lawyers is to revert philosophically, however, to the beliefs and traditions of feudal warriors, rather than to defer to more scientific and democratic approaches to the mutual development of data to aid coming to fairer agreement. Choose comparatively reliable, broadly truth-seeking report on contract or other matters instead of lawyers. Film is the 20th century advance on plain words alone for information provision. Whatever communication advances that have occurred since then are primarily about **the dissemination of numbers, words and pictures**. Democratic values generally require the attempt at clarity, honesty and openness. Numbers have the most

prestige in being most opaquely unquestionable, especially when teamed with lawyers. This is the new feudal world communications order which Mao and I have always stood against. Film is most important in the popularly shared context of Australian regional TV and radio.

Sexual harassment at work, at home and all over the place must be treated together with a conceptual distinction also made between speech and sticking things in people's bodies.

One assumes it is dangerously blinkered to discuss sexual harassment at work without recognizing the wide range of assumptions occurring at home or anywhere else in any multicultural society. These are often derived from a religious or professional background, whether this is openly recognized and understood in broader context than that of the family or individual at work, or not. Good parents, on the other hand, will not send disputing children to find separate lawyers to mull each particular case over secretly, to spring it out later to win it, according to arcane adversarial rules. Lawyers may pretend not to have personal beliefs, except to follow cab-rank orders defined by law and its courts in any regional jurisdiction. They appear to be quietly in bad faith for a living; or else theirs is a feudal belief structure discussed later. To identify legal behaviour as feudal is to define the nature of its power, which is used in the service of the fascist state and its related party and producer interests. The interests of women and children appear historically subsumed in this progression. As the French claim, *'the more things change the more they stay the same'* because of the original feudal power relations which the Chinese state saw as conflicted.

How does sexual harassment fit in with sexual discrimination or anything worse that may happen to anybody anywhere at any time? Sexual harassment (unlike rape or bashing) can't be defined other than in comparatively trivial, individual, highly variable cultural perceptions and it can't be counted. On the other hand, anybody can ideally make a complaint about anything they see as unjust and should go ahead and do so. We should all be better for the inquiry. The drivers of workplace harassment or anything else one doesn't like should always be up for investigation. A cat may consider a king in any arena, for example.

The nature and prevalence of sexual harassment in Australian workplaces is impossible to determine partly because only the most legally privileged individuals, regionally speaking, appear likely to be in positions to seek compensation for any offence they claim to have taken. Lawyers, on the other hand, drive everything towards court fast or slowly by championing their right to silence and secrecy at every expensive turn. In regard to the legal definition of sexual harassment and sexually harassing behaviour, my advice to women and decent men everywhere is: **You must learn to say no at the first encounter.** Consent has been a hard-won historical assumption which matters far more to women than to those who push them around. **For courts to take silence as dissent or consent is alarming for women. Yet silence is often legally expected, as men have had women historically attached to them by marriage, as the priest and the lawyer entrenched and continue to do without proper care for children. They keep doing so with little or no thought of the care of the rest outside the tents they hold up as a sacred or professional ideal. To take refuge in notions of sisterhood as a logical and desirable response is an insult to intelligence difficult to stomach.**

Look to PM Malcolm Turnbull for guidance on parents and babies while he is still with us

These are matters of death and life in which PM Malcolm Turnbull's parents led in pleading in writing to each other and before their adult child for judgment. This is the correct way? What is it if not? The nation demands to know. (See **Born to Rule: The Unauthorised** biography of Malcolm Turnbull, (Manning, P. 2015, p.21) and ask the PM what he thinks. I recently reread **The Shiralee** in Taipei, for example, and burned with hatred for the bushman hero of the story who couldn't care less about women and kids as long as he hurt them enough. That's Catholics for you? I don't know but Ruth Park would be the expert.

Taking each person's perceptions seriously when they matter is the way we all get ahead. It is the judgment of the grounds on which they matter which defines the democratic state; in contrast with the feudal and authoritarian ones, however definitions are made and applied in theory or reality. When words may mean what the legal interpreter wants them to mean we are in trouble as communities which have increasingly known the applied sciences, common dictionary and welfare state widely instead. The law is a growing feudal mystery we keep. Until the people begin to speak up on this the lawyers will bleed the lot like ticks.

As EM Forster wrote, for example, 'How do I know what I think until I see what I say'? This view of human development, necessarily held historically by many in family businesses, is everywhere subdued by law, party demands, related big men on the tools and numbers. Ladies speak up and revolt. Discuss you husband's business openly and widely for a start. (Why bottle it all up in bed?) We will get to Primo Levi's view of love as an endless interrogation if we have time later. He was the Italian chemist in a concentration camp in World War 2 who got out and wrote about it. This is the way ahead not with lawyers. His view was that not to try to communicate is a human failing; **and so is mine as a woman.**

Collegiate cultures or consenting adults in the market, sex acts and death? (Pick 2.)

In 2016 the University of Sydney asked former sex discrimination commissioner Elizabeth Broderick to undertake a review that would enable the colleges "to pursue meaningful and substantial cultural change", following her successful work with the Australian Federal Police and the defence forces, among others. God knows what they do but one naturally assumes it relates to the mission of killing and the culture of secrecy which goes with it.

My attached response on collegiate culture in universities was broadly made to gain better understanding of the effects of constrained speech and sadomasochistic relations in sexual harassment and assault. One bases this generational and demographic analysis on professionally consensual concepts of **consenting adults** in the **market, sex acts and death**. To have children is not to own them. Caring responsibilities lie first with the mother. The welfare state should carefully consider the wrong kind of incentives it often gives to people and try to turn them around into more rational policy directions. Try with Chinese relations.

One's key point is that consent was a very hard-won gain for women, which depends on and ideally encourages speech and increasingly informed experience. The man and the lawyer shape and cut speech off so the lawyer controls. In this new environment today, nobody speaks a bad word for the institution of marriage. I will. It may stunt the growth of people unnecessarily in holding broader beneficial learning back. I cannot tell you how much I have

learned from the male hands that passed through my life. All of them. My life was greatly driven by joys and disappointments in intimate associations. Make of that what you will. The key issue of concern is not marriage but the care of children. Specifically, women will have to have less of them if they want to care for them properly and keep up with men. **Reproduction rates are central to any 'closing of the gaps'.** (Mabel, folks are not blind.)

From this perspective it also appears foolishly confusing, as discussed later, to confine any discussion of sexual harassment to the workplace situation. It appears, for example, to create a related mindset which puts children particularly and also old people in danger of being abused by societal expectations discussed later. Some apparent breaches of care are often picked up by women, supported by lawyers whose representations silence others. In Australia, lawyers control almost everything in law according to wrong, partial, confused and confusing feudal views. A decade of employment in the NSW public service showed me this clearly. This is not only expensive. It prevents the welfare state reaching full effective potential in serving any regional public. I saw this in the Wran and Greiner public service.

To give one of many examples. Conciliation or arbitration of matters didn't work because the lawyers and the investigators of the controlling legal parties kept key information back because they were pushing matters towards the court for supposedly bigger payouts, at least until the lawyers took their huge cuts. The lawyers always seek to extend their control. The public servant is sadly designed to sniff up lawyers' bums, towards the highest court.

Investigate and unpick the basis of Cold War Mentality with Britain, Europe, China and the rest of our region to advance more broadly and openly ahead in development

Construction of IT in institutional and related regional development must now be addressed in the context of the dysfunctional US/Australian relations which the Chinese government has rightly called Cold War mentality. Here Australians live as a US cultural client state after living as a British one before World War 2. The report of the ***Independent Review of the NSW Regulatory Policy Framework (2017)***, chaired by former Premier Nick Greiner is highly convincing, for example, in claiming our regulatory system is highly dysfunctional for any development in the regional stakeholder interest. Many fought this for years and have lost. Lawyers always seek to turn what should be normal freedom of information in operational matters into confidential matters to be dealt with only in terms of secrecy and the lawyers privilege of controlling all speech and writing on matters. This takes us back to the past except in far more costly and dysfunctional ways because of all the add-on legal concerns.

The Australian Constitutions, which mandate separate governments acting separately over three shared sets of constituent subjects and related regional environments, have become increasingly obsolete as the welfare state has expanded to absorb the risks once borne by families and individuals alone. Better approaches to risk management are also necessary which encourage voice, instead of pursuing one's chosen business secretly, under lawyers. Ethical standards required of free-to-air ABC or SBS TV are more up to date and relevant to the public than the lawyer's dissection of life yet the Constitutions rule with feudal courts. The ***Inquiry into the Competitive Neutrality of the National Broadcasters***, is addressed in related media content contexts in the Department of Communication and the Arts; with the potential of more open women's associations with Helen and Future Women at Channel 9.

The key issue of concern is not marriage but the care of children. Specifically, women will have to have fewer of them if they want to care for them properly and keep up with men. **Reproduction rates are central to any 'closing of the gaps'.**

Lawyers typically also guard the rights of any accused far ahead of the rights of any related and involved community. I accuse Warren Mundine of having ten children, for example. Who gave them their bread? I claim this complaint against a man is just as valid or more so than if he had shown me a picture of a nude on a bike. Exactly how in the world today am I expected to voice it? The issue is important as community trouble often starts in regional places remote from cities, where too many children may be unready and unavailable for development work. **Tell Me I'm Okay**, Bradford's history of his life as a communicable diseases doctor, is discussed later to point out the need for better approaches to reproduction to protect children first, as well as everybody else in surrounding communities.

(From the Glebe book launch it seems there are two kind of sex workers: those who give back, like Michael Kirby, and those who may get paid, like Bradford and some others. The innocent women appear more laughable than the men. That's life in colleges I guess.)

Let me be the first to agree instead with ecologist Angela Sanders of **Bush Australia**. She claims on the back of some beautiful post cards *'I think the best thing we can be doing to support threatened species and to keep common species thriving is to plant more bush and reconnect existing bush.* This must be a start for jobs in closing an inequality gap; including reduction in rates of reproduction which the land and surrounding society cannot bear. **Tell me I'm Okay**, on communicable diseases, is ideally addressed in related contexts. I can only guess that it was Kate McGregor's admiration for the courage and honour of women that made her seek whole bodily change away from men in the army, Labor and cricket. Tell us more about it. Women or kids without lawyers, parties and armies could do with a boost.

Community health practice should logically address discrimination first in rural societies because of the impossibility of closing any gap between the haves and have nots without first providing support for very early contraception and abortion rather than marriage. This is because control of fertility must start much earlier than marriage to be realistic. Australians and the global rest should thank China for its population policy which kept away chaos and built for the future. Everywhere globally the middle class have voted with their feet to have fewer children, while the wealthy West attacks China on spurious grounds of human rights, as dumb and wrong as Cold War mentality. Population control policies appear to be the only way to protect many women and children first in remote and rural areas where reproduction rates also appear key drivers of harm to children. This naturally also recognises that harm may be a culturally relative proposition, different in the town and country for a start. Death is more concrete as a measure of life than states of mind. **See it!**

The psychological foundations for normal sado-masochistic relations

I speak naturally as a person like Freud, who believes male defence mechanisms rule the world and are reflected in speech. Jung pointed out the irony of those leading us claiming to love their fellow man, when the world appeared poised, yet again, on the brink of World War. Blame it today on the US Constitution which puts the production and trade in arms above all else, privileging the shooters, manufacturers, sales and the politicians, judges and others they support. Any discussion on the nature and prevalence of sexual harassment must surely start from this position. It cannot be based on accretions of case work for long. It otherwise risks becoming parochial in corruptly serving its mates or family members, in the service of the driving communications innovation which so easily destroys all business. There is such a thing as too much competition and Australia has reached it. Frankly, I felt sexually harassed by the fucking stupid Gay Marriage campaign. I will address this later.

In war we do harm and in intended or unintended consequences call it defence. This is a universal male trait supported by women. One argues here and attached that the moral framework of the 4th estate, exemplified in free to air ABC and SBS TV operation, is far superior to that applied by lawyers and courts. We lose this intellectual spine at the peril of creating rubbish to make lawyers more money. The holistic human state is crazily cut up and subjected to their legal categories. More effective, equitable, reliable and cheap services lie elsewhere than in market approaches driven by lawyers, parties and voting numbers bereft of attention to more broadly evidence-based approaches to development on the ground.

The nature and prevalence of sexual harassment in Australian workplaces is unknowable, because its visibility can only depend on subjective interpretation of the state and that of any allusion to it. This makes sexual harassment different from a black eye, a broken arm or death, for example, which generally turn up before a doctor. Like a high-flying plane or housing bricks and mortar, surely one must first observe that a black eye, broken arm or death appear as less contestable facts, than states of mind do; irrespective of any social situation; irrelevant of influences, drivers or causes of the allusive state. Words are not facts. If wishes were horses, beggars would ride, etc. **You can't often count words or ticks and call it science with any degree of reliability.** This is not just in regard to harassment which is verbal and may or may not be followed up. What you don't know can hurt you.

As a former academic in the Faculty of Health Sciences at Sydney University for eleven years before retiring in 2007, **one found one often had to remind one's colleagues that speaking to people is not the same as sticking things in their bodies.** They couldn't hear me as they like everything reduced to money and numbers on IT. This is the case for putting words and pictures first in regional contexts based on better quality management than collegiate ones can provide. My animosity to 'the party and college elites' starting with lawyers and their clerical heritage, pales into insignificance with the hatred of Norwegian mass murderer, Anders Breivik, for those he saw as living in ignorant privilege. Nevertheless, one could certainly see his point. Words are not actions. One stops them at the common peril of becoming increasingly blind and stupid. Are women dragging us here again? No, it's more the invisible men behind them pushing hard as usual in stupid market directions. The US Constitutional requirement supporting the global arms trade wrecks widely. This is how victims should fight back? The answer surely must be no because only men will win.

Broderick's **Cultural Renewal** report followed the Human Rights Commission's national report on sexual assault and sexual harassment at Australian universities in its focus on complainant advocacy and support services; as distinct from on those who are hiding a trouble related to perceived sexual harassment or anything else. One notes Broderick's recommendations included there should be zero tolerance for sexual misconduct. How is this to be interpreted? The vital importance of adult self-determination and consent, which were hard won gains for far more women than men, appear to be turning back in the opposite direction, to reduce women's responsibility for direct speech and action yet again.

God protect us from those who claim to be our carers by closing our eyes to reality in marriage and the legal monopoly controls over state and private action. Priests and lawyers appear the first to do this, legitimising huge mistreatment of children through increasingly unrealistic parental expectations of the married state in the first place. These are the times where equal treatment at work and elsewhere is increasingly sought in international market terms driven at state level by commercial, government, party and other lawyers together. A woman may not testify in court against a husband, for example. Who does this protect?

Harm Minimisation depends on speech and writing, not clamming up or insinuating

The French often say, one gathers, that one man's meat is another man's fish, (or possibly poison). Harm minimisation begins with the general recognition that a question ideally is faced not ignored and that the responsibility for speech and writing is a good and desirable thing, consistent with the march of civilization, which must normally first be championed by modern mothers and teachers everywhere. To put secrets and complex lies about money and numbers first in their common analysis and action, as lawyers will, does huge damage for the individual and society in general by wilfully cutting and mixing it up at huge cost. For Australia to become a republic would do little or nothing to redress this as far as I know. They never discussed my main concern. Life is often like that for me. Should I be in Europe?

Boris Johnson's UK call for a Brexit from Europe spoke for a lot of people saying they didn't like their money being sent to support a new top layer of various lawyers in Europe, with the European Court making stupid decisions with insufficient knowledge and taking a long time to do it. Meanwhile, the country kept open borders in an operation which seems likely to reduce older ways of life and service that many of the earlier or original inhabitants considered a lot better. Australian aborigines have sympathy with this position no doubt?

A related women and children's regional election and policy direction is addressed attached and was sent in an open letter to Professor Deborah Brennan, a key specialist in children's services at the Social Policy Research Centre at the University of New South Wales and also to state, federal and local government representatives, etc. One recently received a clear and informative plan of work direction entitled '**Clean Economy Fair Society**' from state Green MP Jamie Parker, the member for Balmain. It states he worked directly with the Attorney General to secure funding for the **Women's Family Law Court Support Services**. **What are they expected to do and how does it work?** The court drags a lot of working women behind it. It took me years to see that it was lawyers not I who were totally nuts. Men of experience everywhere should have picked it up earlier and spoken up. They often seem to me to be a gutless, nasty mob, lying and also hiding behind dumber family skirts.

(Fancy calling the plane bombing Hiroshima after the pilot's mother, for example. Many don't have the courage of their own convictions without some tame woman in tow.)

All should try talking to each other openly for the logical reason that we all occupy the same land, in one way or another, although some may have particular responsibilities for action, while others may act in purely advisory or complaint roles. This understanding of joint dominion over the same territory and people is more important than a court or political party affiliation unless one seeks to remain a self-blinded creature of the particular mob for all one's life. Lawyers have no trouble ensuring this happens, starting from the top and infecting doctors and others. It is hard, for example, to imagine a more disingenuous address than that given by former PM Keating in his speech on **Film and Art in the Australia of Nationalism and Cynicism** to the Sydney Film School in July 2007. We do not need this kind of leader's drivel comparing nationalism and patriotism while deciding he is a patriot and John Howard is not. This stupid, condescending and offensive stuff is in **After Words**. These guys live in a world where mixing things up is useful to them and good for a laugh.

In **High Fidelity** Nick Hornby's hero says that *'only people of a certain kind of disposition are afraid of being left alone for the rest of their lives at the age of twenty-six. We were of that disposition'*. That doesn't mean we should champion marriage for the rest of anyone's life, including our own, homosexual or not. The idealisation of a married state carries key risks for children if parents cannot sustain the common romantic as distinct from feudal lies under modern drivers. Children suffer. Yet men everywhere, in almost every state, may close their eyes to this and be protected by brothers.

Any modern young woman firstly assumes, however, that it is better to know more about a man rather than less, before she marries him or even cohabits. This is an example of common sense, which must naturally also be judged in the realms of any personal belief. Both are often apt to change as society changes and we learn and experience different things and grow older and die (as distinct from experiencing everlasting life in permanent marriage and beyond). Lawyers judge all matters by written standards that are outdated by their loyalty to feudal standards. Only the aggrieved who have the means come to court. This is a bad context in which to judge the nature and prevalence of sexual harassment or any other perceived or actual injury, such as obtained in physical assault or death, presenting to doctors. Different cultural expectations lead to different views of sexual harassment, assault, consent and all else. You can't rip them up in separate treatments. You have to start with a willingness to get down on the ground without prejudice. You go.

There are better ways of dealing with perceived harassment of any kind than the legal mind seems capable of providing. It denies its own class of interests in matters. It starts supposedly championing the interests of clients and representing what is supposedly good for populations; as if they are the secret background daddies of us all, inside us. We are paying through taxes or in other ways for what must be seen as abysmal services from any more broadly scientific or democratic viewpoint than a lot of privileged male youth nurtured in church schools and related associations. One addresses women and harassment in this global context referring naturally to the US Constitution and the global arms trade first. You appreciate how horrible this is for me to recount, as poor women love lawyers so much.

When faced with any language, pictures, dogshit, etc. speak up fast and tell your objections so that everybody present can get greater understanding of where they appear to stand. Is there sexual harassment in marriage as well as rape? God alone knows? These lawyers and their US family mates couldn't lie straight in bed yet create Australia in their idiotic image. Any discussion of an Australian republic is pointless unless it addresses the expense of lawyers' controlling mentality, pretending they speak logically for the rest in many inquiries, freed of self-interest; and that they are the only ones who can or should, because they do. Nothing amazes me more than that this threadbare rubbish has gone on for so long, while only referred to obliquely in any discussion. What is wrong with you people? Speak up.

Here I stand with Brett Doran and the film in production: The Art of the Girls in Tin Sheds

This is the point from which begins all related discussion which has influenced the Australian people, including sexual harassment at work or anywhere else, as discussed. I speak as the former Assistant Director and program manager of the first Women's Directorate in NSW government who oversaw and serviced many changes in anti-discrimination, health and sexual health services, and in related Conventions as well as in national and state legislation, standards and codes. As the Manager of the Prevention Programs Branch, which is the idiotic two-edged name I was given, I later oversaw the folding of most of the Department of Industrial Relations and Employment into the Workers Compensation Court to become the WorkCover Authority instead. As a result of this work I developed a burning hatred for lawyers and everything they represent, which starts with them setting themselves up as feudal secret authorities in narrowly feudal family circles, dictating to the more practical and knowledgeable rest. I bet my guts Malcolm Turnbull hates them too. (It's just a theory. Helen McCabe thinks the time is right for a subscription model while I adore free to air TV.)

A related case is put later and attached that broader and more open development of words and pictures in more rational regional management contexts will be cheaper and better for everybody's wellbeing than supporting all preaching to the particular choirs, secret or not. Australian governments have seen repeatedly in workers compensation insurance, for example, that there is such a thing as too much competition. It also fuels financial instability and the growing inequality and devastation wreaked on the commons by all growth, including reproduction by tribal people of any colour, that is greater than the national norm.

The lawyer promotes and supports feudally secret responses to any perceived problems by those rich enough to afford the price or privileged enough to offload it on the public purse. These feudally defined associations are also reflected in the original institution of marriage as the key property relationship which guarantees the male care and control of his wife and children for life. These are increasingly unrealistic expectations of marriage in the welfare state, internet and gig economy age. They set people up for bitterness and hatred when they experience what they feel as betrayal, which is common enough. This destroys the welfare of children easily enough without the urgings of lawyers or homosexual people towards marriage, as if time and change can or should stand still. The subjectivity of any notion of sexual harassment is too great for its nature to be consistently addressed across the range of cultural communities which may exist at any single workplace, let alone the lot. Women who feel harassed by anything must learn to speak up for themselves first, and not withdraw from the duty to speak up to protect their less powerful children or clients, for example. This does not mean the latter should be silenced, or duelling lawyers should take over.

Towards better quality service, including in land and housing, mining and manufacturing. (Starting with a film called 'The Art of the Girls in Tin Sheds' and also remembering 'A Man Called Peter'.)

Ideally any welfare program and related project action is more broadly and openly designed to meet quality service requirements in regional connexions which may be comparatively objectively or subjectively driven. Death is a comparatively objective measure, compared with diagnosis of any mental state, which is more subjectively driven in every way, for example. I champion words and pictures rather than money and numbers in related regional and industry policy connexions. This starts, for example, with the later contract on making the film **'The art of the girls in tin sheds'**.

This attention to the design and storage of words and pictures supporting any development is ideally undertaken, along with other comparative estimates of service quality. This includes on cost reductions through addressing harm minimisation on any related regional basis. This position includes land accommodating industrial or other production for home life. Harm may occur across many communities and be driven by a particular workplace location or not. Sexual harassment and sex related harm are ideally conceptualised in broader arenas than in any paid work. Is this clear?

I have never been in private sector management but I went thoroughly through the process of corporate planning in the public sector in NSW and also in a new statutory authority with a board, (the WorkCover Authority) which I provided with advice and minutes. Insurance premiums paid to insurance companies who then held these industry and govt. funds in corporate authority trust, produced the money which was used to achieve the goals in legislation which related to obtaining safety at work and rehabilitation after injury. It was incredibly interesting and a much abused or never really tried great management model, in my opinion. The statutory authority business planning model is dictated by goals in legislation which are broader than commercial goals in the sense that they start with World Health Organization or related UN goals and related regional data gathering in many cases. The CEO of the Authority reports closely to the Minister as well as to the board composed of fund stakeholders. He or she may also openly step into board matters to ensure the legislative goals are being met in the particular case. This more open state and business led, goal directed corporate management process is broader, more reliable, safer and cheaper than the normal US approach to health insurance and related developments. See more at www.Carolodonnell.com.au This authority flies theoretically in the face of older legal norms who in practice quickly drag it down and try to kill it to produce something better to their secretly controlling liking. The idea that lawyers speak on behalf of the public in an identity of interest is feudal rubbish we buy out of our own forced and ignorant fear. Oz appears as a comparatively well-run and caring fascist (provider driven) state since 1900. Pity about all the feudal laws and lawyers holding more democratic operation back.

Any person who feels strongly when faced with what she feels to be sexually harassing examples of behaviour, should just say **no for herself**. She may also allude to all the examples of sexually harassing behaviour she sees; whether she thinks she alone is the recipient of some generally unwanted action or that one or more others are; as well or

instead. She should put her anxieties in writing as early as possible if necessary, so as not to forget. Anyone who can't speak or write English well should ask somebody she trusts to transcribe her story. This will clarify her own thoughts on the matter, inform others, and also allow them to be corrected in any later writing she carries out, or which is carried out by others. Such a correspondence trail can assist anybody in any matter of dispute for resolution. Lawyers destroy everything they touch through their feudally clinging responses addressed later. Frankly, I would never touch them except under their extreme duress. The contract I made with Brett Doran based on our first meeting minutes made more sense.

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

I wrote the **Art of the Girls in Tin Sheds** film proposal and the attached industry critique to develop regional policy and service directions. This exercise in film production may be compared with normal professional treatment of numbers, words, pictures, sounds and their communication, in more narrowly feudal ways. I seek the light in the opposing regional direction that former PM, Kevin Rudd, addressed in challenges for the Digital Dividend Direction. This is discussed attached and on www.Carolodonnell.com.au

The attempt made in any related proposal to initiate some key film production is also to address key industry problems in the linked context of the need for better understanding of quality data and product storage and retrieval mechanisms. The alternative approach, linked with overwhelming and draining US interests, often thought of as left wing, involves more ignorant and unreliable numerical push polling of one form or another. The attached discussion and proposed action on film is geared to using knowledge from diverse regional contexts to better effect for all beneficiaries. The stockholder is a key stakeholder ideally directed in more open and more reliable regional service to other key stakeholders. The industry superannuation model pioneered by government, business and the ACTU and the related concept of how the beneficiaries are protected from market instability and unnecessary fees or charges was a vital work structure which can be undermining or improving in its future direction for greater improvement in Australia and globally.

I therefore want to make the film or films as discussed in the attached files, starting with **The Art of the Girls in Tin Sheds**, made with Brett Doran. Dear God please help me to support Brett for a start. I beg you to rattle the tin before friends and beg them to kick in. I hope he is engaged on our collective ventures as we speak. See the contract he accepted below for example. It only took one night to come to agreement and settle. Beat that with your lawyers you feudally driven fools. Others tell all your friends to kick in the tin for **The Art of the Girls in Tin Sheds**; the more powerful, far less recognized, antithesis of Mambo.

Cheers

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

Hi Brett

PRELIMINARY DRAFT AGREEMENT FROM MEETING ON THE ART OF THE GIRLS IN TIN SHEDS
(20.7.2018)

I am just setting down my understanding of our agreement so far before I forget it as I understand it. Please feel totally free to correct me from your perspective.

First let me say what a total delight it was to meet you. It amazes me that I have no friends and yet I occasionally meet people who I find enormously interesting and you definitely are one of those. This is what I think we agreed to do together:

1. I look forward to you making some film related product of your own design on the basis of what we discussed today and the Girls in the Tin Sheds material I gave you.
2. I pay you \$5000 for the above product which commenced tonight when you took the material. I will put \$2000 in your account as soon as you give me your BSB and related bank details.
3. You work on the above at your leisure and I pay you the remaining \$3000 in full on product completion or as otherwise necessary for mutual convenience.
4. In a related arena, I will go ahead and try to nab two more women (Jan Fieldsend and one other, probably Ann Stephen) with a view to more art display and related interview if our views coincide reasonably enough on the project, especially in financial terms. If you agree to be the photographer I will definitely buy the requisite microphone for the project.

We will discuss related aspects of the larger film project and finance as the issues come up.

5. I will get in touch with Nick and Jane to ask them to meet you at my place. (I think Nick is a bit sick of tutoring me for old time's sake so I don't know if this is likely to happen. I will tell him you couldn't find his films on the internet either.)

Finally, I just want to make my views on intellectual property a bit clearer in the sense that I can't keep secrets well and I also reserve the right to send whatever I write to anybody I like at any time.

I hope all the above is reasonably similar to your memory of events and I would be grateful for any words of correction or addition from your perspective. (I found Toni's notes on what she said and will type them out and send them to you tomorrow.)

If you would like to meet up once a week for dinner or preferably lunch at my place I would be delighted but please let me know of any other form of communication or meeting place better for you. You should know my time is completely free except for Thursdays and I don't like late nights or even nights all that much. I usually like to be in bed with a calming and improving book.

Cheers and grateful for comment of any nature. It doesn't have to be long.

Carol