

24 August 2022

National Cultural Policy Submission

I am submitting this submission on behalf of myself. An artist (professional actor).

My name is Sachin Joab.

I confirm that my submission can be made public.

Please note, I understand that the length of this National Cultural Policy Submission was limited to 3 pages. Reasons for my submission being longer is because of the related *Acts* and *Codes* that I have copied and pasted for your attention from the Federal Register of Legislation.

The original 5 goals of the 2013 Creative Australia National Cultural Policy were:

1. Recognise, respect and celebrate the centrality of First Nations cultures to the uniqueness of Australian identity.
 2. Ensure that government support reflects the diversity of Australia.
 3. Support excellence and the special role of artists and their creative collaborators.
 4. Strengthen the capacity of the cultural sector to contribute to national life, community wellbeing and the economy.
 5. Ensure Australian creativity thrives here and abroad in the digitally enabled 21st century.
- For the purposes of the consultation we have distilled these into 5 pillars: First Nations, A Place for Every Story, the Centrality of the Artist, Strong Institutions and Reaching the Audience.

To add to those 5 goals, I would like all actors of colour, including non-Indigenous/First Nations peoples to also be recognised and respected as part of the uniqueness of Australian identity on Australian screens, specifically in both lead and co-starring roles. Let me explain.

I am a born and raised Australian from an Indian background. My skin is brown. As blunt as that might sound I feel it needs to be stated because it is at the core of my National Cultural Policy Submission.

For reference, at any point that I am referring to 'actors of colour' I do not solely mean Indigenous/First Nations actors; I am also including actors of colour from Indian/Asian backgrounds.

According to the ABS (Australian Bureau of Statistics) the 2021 Census showed 783,958 Australians declared Indian ancestry. This number makes the Indian diaspora one of the top two largest in Australia. According to UN figures in January 2023 (only 5 months away) India will overtake China as the world's most populous country with 1.4 billion people. To combat the skilled workers shortage and economic problems in Australia the federal government will be increasing the yearly migration increase to 200,000 in 2023. Given the current and ongoing friction with China, many of the migrants will be coming from India.

The federal government will now be recognising international qualifications and will even generate bridging training to discontinue multiple years of needless courses.

I have been a professional actor for over the last 15 years. I am 43 years old. To initially step into the screen industry as an actor I attended numerous acting classes as a child. These acting classes began at the age of 12 years old. I was raised by a single mother on a single income in a working class suburb. My mother would drive me to acting classes after her full time job. I continued taking acting classes throughout my teen years and into my 20's. I then went to New York and studied acting at The Actors Studio. Upon my return to Melbourne I attended drama school at an accredited institute for 3 years graduating in acting. Despite all my training I was unable to secure representation for 10 years in my own country of Australia. I was told by Australian agencies that they “do not have room on their books for my ethnicity”. I kept my head down and ploughed through year after year despite seeing inexperienced Caucasian actors without any training securing actor representation with ease. After receiving two television roles on my own without the help of an agency I was able to finally secure representation in 2007.

In 2011 I made history as the first actor of colour to be contracted as a main cast member on the long-running iconic television drama *Neighbours*. Despite receiving backlash from some of the Australian public with comments such as “send them back to India” I kept my head down and worked hard. My tenure on *Neighbours* lasted two years. Actors arrived and left on *Neighbours*. However, when a main cast family was written into the series they remained on *Neighbours* for a minimum of two years with an option of extending their contracts. Despite my character being very popular in the UK (which was the main audience base for *Neighbours*) and receiving high ratings, as well as an immense amount of fan mail, the decision was made to terminate my contract after only one year. My character had a wife (*Priya*) who was an actress of colour and a daughter (*Rani*) who was also an actress of colour. Like me, both of their full time contracts ended after only one year. The decision was made to kill-off my wife's character. Then to verify that her character was truly deceased approval was given for her to be written in as a ghost. This was done to ensure with certainty that she would never return to *Neighbours*. At that point, my role on *Neighbours* had briefly shifted to playing a single dad, which was absolutely fine for me. Reason being, I knew there would be various interesting storylines that could easily be written in as a single multicultural dad raising his multicultural daughter in modern-day Australia. However, after a brief office meeting I was specifically told that *Neighbours* have “decided to send Ajay and Rani back to India”. I was confused. To go “back” to a country that my daughter and I were not from didn't make sense. Both of our characters were written in as being born and raised in Australia. Furthermore, according to the scripts our characters would be settling in India because they would no longer be seen again in the *Neighbours* suburb of Erinsborough. In the office meeting I mentioned numerous storylines that could obviously (and easily) be written in as an Australian of colour raising his daughter who is also an Australian of colour. Despite people in the *Neighbours* writing team agreeing that there were fantastic storylines in playing a single dad which needed to be explored, expressing those storylines in that office meeting with *Neighbours* decision makers was like speaking to a brick wall. Their decision was made. Additionally, there was another actress of colour on *Neighbours* at the time who was also employed as the character *Vanessa*. Meaning, there were four main cast members on *Neighbours* who were of colour. A decision was approved to write the character of *Vanessa* out also. As such, *Neighbours* would return to an all-Caucasian main cast.

In April 2021 *Neighbours* was legally investigated for multiple claims of racism that occurred behind the scenes. The legal investigation was finalised in November 2021. Eight months later the final episode of *Neighbours* aired in July 2022. Its British broadcaster Channel 5 in the UK announced that it was axing the show. After playing in over 60 countries it still could not find one single broadcaster to fund production based on the racist stigma that was directly connected to *Neighbours*; which ironically was caused by the decision makers attached to *Neighbours*. Point being, a 37 year old Australian show was terminated; not because of ratings but because of racism.

I recall a recent conversation where an employee who had worked there for a number of years said to me “Sach, there are hundreds of people who work at *Neighbours*. The executive producer said he can see a lot of them crying because they've lost their full time jobs”.

My response was: *‘I feel sorry for them and it is sad but why didn’t the decision makers, including those at MEAA (Media Entertainment Arts Alliance) care about the tears of actors of colour when we lost our full time jobs on Neighbours based on our race’*.

To view a recent interview by SBS news journalist Sarah Conte (dated 27 July 2022) I have provided two links for your attention.

<https://www.sbs.com.au/news/video/neighbours-actor-reflects-on-his-role-as-ajay-kapoor-as-show-ends-37-year-run/sf4j94vjz>

<https://www.sbs.com.au/news/article/sachins-character-made-history-on-neighbours-then-got-sent-back-to-india/p55pguhrz>

Over the years I have noticed that unless there is an essential non-negotiable reason for a producer/production team to hire an actor of colour for a lead or co-starring role (i.e, non-fictional/true stories) it will not occur. Meaning, the majority of Caucasian actors are hired **by default** for lead/co-starring roles in Australian film and television, irrespective of whether the screen projects are fictitious or non-fictitious.

Screen Australia is the governing Board and Management of the Australian screen sector. They replaced the Australian Film Commission, the Film Finance Corporation Australia Limited and Film Australia Limited. In the *Functions* section of the Screen Australia Act 2008 it states:

“(1) The functions of Screen Australia are to:

(a) support and promote the development of a highly creative, innovative, and commercially sustainable Australian screen production industry”.

How can Screen Australia support and promote the development of a highly creative, innovative, and especially a commercially sustainable screen production industry by excluding Australian actors of colour from lead/co-starring roles in Australian film and television? Screen Australia may refute this rhetorical question. So I will rephrase; why does Screen Australia help in funding film and television screen projects where the overwhelmingly majority of lead/main roles consist of Caucasian actors?

Evidence regarding Australian audiences distancing themselves from traditional Australian film and television began to become evident in 2015 when Netflix expanded into Australia. As of 2020, 12.2 million Australians have subscribed to Netflix. Amazon Prime arrived in 2018, Apple TV Plus in 2019, Paramount in 2021 to name a few. What Australian audiences are seeing on those streaming services is not just an eclectic range of genres and categories but they are also seeing a wide range of people from various cultural backgrounds in lead/main roles. Compare that to the majority of traditional Australian film and television.

It might be convenient for Screen Australia to say that they do not have control over the choices that Australian producers and directors make in rejecting actors of colour for lead/main cast roles and instead hiring Caucasian actors - by default. However, Screen Australia does have control over what productions they choose to fund, or not fund.

As part of my National Cultural Policy Submission I am requesting 3 new policies/regulations be incorporated into the Screen Australia act of 2008.

My 3 New Suggested Policies:

- 1) Every Australian film/television series that is seeking funding from Screen Australia for their film/television projects must justify why there is not an equal ethnic ratio amongst their lead/main cast roles; especially for screen projects based on fiction. As a simple example, if there are 6 lead/main cast roles in a fictional Australian film/television series and 4 of those lead roles/main roles are Caucasian, Screen Australia must request the producers/production team of that project to provide credible, valid, logical and reasonable justification as to why only 2 of the 6 lead actors/main cast are actors of colour and not an equal 3 Caucasian and 3 of colour. An example of an unsatisfactory justification from the producers/production team as to why they chose to hire a Caucasian majority would be that they were '*unable to locate actors of colour*'. In such instances, Screen Australia must not provide funding for such film/television projects. Funding such projects would endanger Screen Australia from potentially breaching their own *Screen Australia Act 2008* (please see sections below), the *Racial Discrimination Act 1975* (please see sections below), and The *Public Governance, Performance and Accountability Act 2013* (please see below).

Additionally, Screen Australia would be in breach of the newly incorporated policies/regulations that I am attempting to implement with this National Cultural Policy Submission. In short, equal ethnic ratio for lead/main cast roles must be adhered to, as opposed to conveniently casting one or two actors of colour into guest roles for the sake of ticking a diversity box and not being labelled racist.

- 2) If an overseas production company wants to shoot a film/television series in Australia and the script includes lead actors/main cast who are of colour, it will be the Australian actors of colour based in Australia who by default will receive privilege/favour for those lead/main roles. This will occur even if the overseas production company/s have incorporated the majority of funds into the screen project. Reason being, those production companies are shooting in our country Australia. For example, the BBC from Britain or NBC from America are funding a film/miniseries which is shooting in Australia which contains actors of colour in lead/main cast roles. As such, it will be Australian actors of colour based in Australia who will be offered those lead/main cast roles before actors from Britain or America. Only when that has been contractually agreed to should Screen Australia permit those international production companies to film their projects in Australia.
- 3) In any given year, if for example ten screen projects are filmed in Australia, only two can be set in a year prior to 1973. Reason being, the *Immigration Restriction Act 1901* (White Australia Policy) was still law prior to 1973. Therefore, the majority of lead/main cast roles set in those pre-time periods will by default be Caucasian and/or Indigenous/First Nations cast. Meaning, such screen projects will exclude other Australian actors of colour. Therefore, certain producers/production companies might still be interested in setting the majority of their screen projects in those periods prior to 1973 as there would be no opposition to not casting other actors of colour. Australian film/tv creators can obviously set their screen projects at any point in history that they choose. What I am proposing is for Screen Australia to keep the funding for such projects set prior to 1973 at a minimal for the sake of inclusiveness of all actors of colour to expand our Australian screen stories; as the Americans and British have been doing for a long time.

In recent times, Australian films have been unable to win an Oscar Award in America. As I understand, the last Australian film that won an Oscar for Best Film was *The Kings Speech*. That was 12 years ago, which had an all-caucasian cast. Are Screen Australia, Media Entertainment Arts Alliance, Screen Producers Australia, and the Screen Diversity Inclusion Network aware that in 2020 the Oscars introduced new guidelines. Films must meet two of four diversity standards to be eligible for a best-picture nomination.

These Standards promote more inclusive representation, as well as promote more inclusive employment in lead/co-starring/main cast roles. Movies hoping to win or even be nominated at the Oscars will need to meet these Standards in two of four categories in order to qualify.

The first set of stipulations are:

STANDARD A: ON-SCREEN REPRESENTATION, THEMES AND NARRATIVES

To achieve Standard A, the film must meet ONE of the following criteria:

A1. Lead or significant supporting actors

At least one of the lead actors or significant supporting actors is from an underrepresented racial or ethnic group.

- Asian
- Hispanic/Latin
- Black/African American
- Indigenous/Native American/Alaskan Native
- Middle Eastern/North African
- Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander
- Other underrepresented race or ethnicity

A2. General ensemble cast

At least 30% of all actors in secondary and more minor roles are from at least two of the following underrepresented groups:

- Women
- Racial or ethnic group
- LGBTQ+
- People with cognitive or physical disabilities, or who are deaf or hard of hearing

A3. Main storyline/subject matter

The main storyline(s), theme or narrative of the film is centered on an underrepresented group(s).

- Women
- Racial or ethnic group
- LGBTQ+
- People with cognitive or physical disabilities, or who are deaf or hard of hearing

For a more comprehensive understanding I have provided the following link.

<https://www.oscars.org/news/academy-establishes-representation-and-inclusion-standards-oscar-eligibility>

For your reference, The Annenberg Inclusion Initiative is the leading think tank in the world studying diversity and inclusion in entertainment through original research and sponsored projects. Beyond research, the Annenberg Inclusion Initiative develops targeted, research-based solutions to tackle inequality. The Annenberg Inclusion Initiative works in three major areas:

RESEARCH: Uses data-driven and theory-based research to offer insight and evidence to industries on where diversity is needed and how to achieve it

ADVOCACY: Exists to foster inclusion and give a voice to disenfranchised or marginalized groups

ACTION: Offers simple actions for complex solutions to facilitate social change at the student, industry, and societal level

For a more comprehensive understanding I have provided the following link

<https://annenberg.usc.edu/research/aii>

How does Australia possibly think they can keep up with these Standards when there is not one single Australian actor of colour who is known internationally? Every Australian actor/actress who are known internationally are all Caucasian (Cate Blanchett, Hugh Jackman, Nicole Kidman, Guy Pearce, Toni Collette, etc). The reason for this is because Australian producers/industry decision-makers provided those actors/actresses with their initial screen foundation, publicity and promotion in Australia. In-turn, fostering the commencement of their acting careers, which subsequently assisted in the advancement and ultimate elevation of their overseas lead role/main cast careers. Australian actors of colour do not receive the same equality when it comes to such screen career development. Meaning, if actors/actresses like Cate, Hugh, Nicole, etc were actors of colour the world would more than likely have never experienced their talent because the Australian producers/industry decision-makers would not have kickstarted their careers. Similarly, overseas African-American/black actors like Denzel Washington, Halle Berry, Morgan Freeman, etc would more than likely be unknown if they were born and raised in Australia (as has been my personal experience as an Australian actor of colour). Had those talented African-American/black Oscar-winning actors/actresses been from Australia they would have only been hired only as guest actors and would be unknown. The only instances in Australia where those non-Caucasian actors might have potentially been cast in lead roles is if it were essential to do so. Reason being, Australian producers/decision-makers overwhelmingly choose to hire Caucasian actors for lead/main cast roles - by default.

Incorporating my 3 new policy suggestions for Screen Australia, Screen Producers Australia, and the Media Entertainment Arts Alliance will be the safeguard from endangering our Australian film and television projects from falling into a lonely Caucasian corner.

My 3 new policy suggestions also abide by:

- The *Screen Australia Act 2008*, **Part 2 – Screen Australia**, Section 6 (Functions) and 7 (Powers), as well as **Part 3 – The Board of Screen Australia**, Section 9 (Role) and;
- The *Racial Discrimination Act 1975*, **Part II—Prohibition of Racial Discrimination**, Section 9, 1, (Racial Discrimination to be Unlawful), 10, (Rights to Equality before the Law), and 15 (Employment) and;
- The *Public Governance, Performance and Accountability Act 2013*, **Division 2—Accountable authorities Subdivision A**—General duties of accountable authorities, 15 Duty to govern the Commonwealth entity (1), (a), (b). **Division 3—Officials Subdivision A—General duties of officials** 26, 27, 28. **Chapter 4—Rules, delegations and independent review**, Part 4-1—The rules 102.

For your attention, the above Sections and Codes that I have mentioned are listed below:

Screen Australia Act 2008

Part 2 - Screen Australia

6 Functions

(1) The functions of Screen Australia are to;

(c) support and promote the development of screen culture in Australia

(3) In performing its functions Screen Australia is, as far as practicable, to;

(a) ensure the development of a diverse range of Australian programs that deal with matters of national interest or importance to Australians, or that illustrate or interpret aspects of Australia or the life and activities of Australian people

(e) promote the efficient, effective and ethical use of public resources.

(6) without limiting its effect apart from this subsection, this Act also has the effect it would have if the powers and functions of Screen Australia were confined to powers and functions that were to be exercised and performed;

(b) for purposes for which it is appropriate for the Parliament, as the national Parliament of Australia, to authorise Screen Australia to exercise powers and perform functions.

(7) Powers

(1) Screen Australia has power to do all things necessary or convenient to be done for connection the performance of its function.

Part 3 - The Board of Screen Australia

9 Role

(1) The Board is responsible for ensuring the proper and efficient performance of Screen Australia's functions.

(2) The Board has power to do all things necessary or convenient to be done for or in connection with the performance of its duties.

(3) All acts and things done in the name of, or on behalf of, Screen Australia by the Board, or with the authority of the Board, are taken to have been done by Screen Australia.

(4) If a function or power of Screen Australia is dependent on the opinion, belief or state of mind of Screen Australia in relation to a matter, the function or power may be exercised upon the opinion, belief or state of mind of a person or body acting as mentioned in subsection (3) in relation to that matter.

Racial Discrimination Act 1975

Part II—Prohibition of racial discrimination

Section 9 Racial discrimination to be unlawful;

(1)

It is unlawful for a person to do any act involving a distinction, exclusion, restriction or preference based on race, colour, descent or national or ethnic origin which has the purpose or effect of nullifying or impairing the recognition, enjoyment or exercise, on an equal footing, of any human right or fundamental freedom in the political, economic, social, cultural or any other field of public life.

10 Rights to equality before the law;

(1) If, by reason of, or of a provision of, a law of the Commonwealth or of a State or Territory, persons of a particular race, colour or national or ethnic origin do not enjoy a right that is enjoyed by persons of another race, colour or national or ethnic origin, or enjoy a right to a more limited extent than persons of another race, colour or national or ethnic origin, then, notwithstanding anything in that law, persons of the first-mentioned race, colour or national or ethnic origin shall, by force of this section, enjoy that right to the same extent as persons of that other race, colour or national or ethnic origin.

15 Employment;

(1)

(a) to refuse or fail to employ a second person on work of any description which is available and for which that second person is qualified.

(b) to refuse or fail to offer or afford a second person the same terms of employment, conditions of work and opportunities for training and promotion as are made available for other persons having the same qualifications and employed in the same circumstances on work of the same description; or

The Public Governance, Performance and Accountability Act 2013

Division 2—Accountable authorities

Subdivision A—General duties of accountable authorities

15 Duty to govern the Commonwealth entity

(1) The accountable authority of a Commonwealth entity must govern the entity in a way that:

(a) promotes the proper use and management of public resources for which the authority is responsible; and (b) promotes the achievement of the purposes of the entity;

Division 3—Officials

Subdivision A—General duties of officials

26 Duty to act honestly, in good faith and for a proper purpose

An official of a Commonwealth entity must exercise his or her powers, perform his or her functions and discharge his or her duties honestly, in good faith and for a proper purpose.

27 Duty in relation to use of position

An official of a Commonwealth entity must not improperly use his or her position:

- (a) to gain, or seek to gain, a benefit or an advantage for himself or herself or any other person; or*
- (b) to cause, or seek to cause, detriment to the entity, the Commonwealth or any other person.*

28 Duty in relation to use of information

A person who obtains information because they are an official of a Commonwealth entity must not improperly use the information:

- (a) to gain, or seek to gain, a benefit or an advantage for himself or herself or any other person; or*
- (b) to cause, or seek to cause, detriment to the Commonwealth entity, the Commonwealth or any other person.*

Chapter 4—Rules, delegations and independent review

Part 4-1—The rules

102 Rules relating to the Commonwealth and Commonwealth entities

(1) The rules may make provision for the following in relation to the Commonwealth and Commonwealth entities:

- (a) ensuring or promoting the proper use and management of public resources;*
- (b) ensuring or promoting proper accountability for the use and management of public resources;*
- (d) risk oversight and management;*

To convince you of the cultural hazard for our Australian screen industry if this ongoing issue of rejecting Australian actors of colour when it is non-essential continues as is, maybe it might help if I quote a Caucasian Australian actress. In her 2018 Academy Award acceptance speech at the Dolby Theatre in Hollywood Cate Blanchett said “*there is so much talent in Australia*”. She never said there is so much Caucasian talent in Australia.

Please begin casting Australian actors of colour in lead/main cast roles via legal policy enforcements rather than endangering important decisions to short-sighted people with biased mindsets who are content with the long-running (and frankly racist) status quo. How else can one rationally explain continuing to cast Caucasian actors in the overwhelming majority of lead/main screen roles - by default? From an international perspective, the disunion between Caucasian Australians and the First Nations People regarding not having a treaty as other nations do with their Indigenous people is viewed as a public shame. If this additional ongoing pattern regarding hiring Caucasian actors for lead/main screen roles by default continues it will surely be at the Australian screen industries detriment from an international perspective. Another way of putting it would be to ask our current Australian film investors, screen producers and decision makers if they want to be on the inclusive multicultural side of history or the racist xenophobic side of history? There isn't a midway point.

This overdue cultural screen change will not be initiated by the current industry decision-makers at Screen Australia. Otherwise, the correct racial inclusive measures would have been implemented when Screen Australia was established back in 2008 after it took over the functions and appropriations of its predecessor agencies, AFC (Australian Film Commission), FFC (Film Finance Corporation) and Film Australia Limited. The undeniable proof that that these crucial changes have not been enacted is evident on our screens. The overwhelming majority of Australian film and television casts Caucasian actors in lead and main roles - by default. There is no evidence to the contrary.

According to the Screen Australia Act 2008, **Part 3—The Board of Screen Australia, Section 11 (4) Appointment of members**, it states:

“A person must not be appointed for a period if the sum of:

(a) that period; and

(b) any periods of previous appointment of the person as a member; exceeds 9 years”

There are currently 7 Board members and 7 Management personnel at Screen Australia. All 7 Board members are permitted to remain in their roles till between 2023 – 2025. As I understand it, there is no time limit for the 7 Management personnel. I am unsure why?

All 14 Board and Management members possess between 15 – 30 years of job-related experience, which is intended to be applied to their current respective employment at Screen Australia. Their job proficiencies range from working in national/international film and television studios, networks, broadcasting, sales, acquisitions, distribution, investment, development, digital media, legal affairs, compliance, regulation, journalism, business, finance, administration, research, accountancy, marketing, analysis, producing, directing, creating, public affairs, corporate communications, psychology, and various senior roles as presidents, managing and executive directors of policy, arts, strategy, standards, due diligence, Heads of media, Chairmen, CEO's.....and yet - this ongoing problematic racially-biased issue whereby the overwhelming majority of Australian film and television casts Caucasian actors in lead/main roles by default continues; unless it is essential to cast an actor of colour due to the storyline correlation.

Additionally, an Audit Committee is managed within Screen Australia by 4 members. It was established in accordance with Section 45 of the PGPA (*Public Governance, Performance and Accountability Act 13*), to assist the Board in the discharge of its responsibilities. 3 of the above 14 members, plus one other member (the Chair) assemble the 4 members of the Audit Committee at Screen Australia. I am unsure how ethical it is to have 3 of the Board members being the same 3 of 4 on the Audit Committee (effectively auditing themselves). In any case, even though only 4 of the 14 Board and Management members are of colour, all of their roles obligate them to abide by and uphold the Act. If they, and all of their predecessors over the last 14 years at Screen Australia had rectified the onscreen race imbalance regarding producers/decision-makers defaulting towards Caucasian actors/actresses for lead/main roles I would not have felt compelled to highlight this ongoing matter.

Another factor is Reality TV. It has infiltrated the majority of Australian television. This obviously takes jobs away from genuine Australian screen drama, which is where Australian national art and culture can be displayed and experienced, as opposed to reality tv (i.e - *Goggle Box*, where Australian audiences watch reality tv audiences, who are sitting on their couches while watching other reality tv shows). Screen drama producers, directors, editors, wardrobe/make-up departments, and crew can choose to work on reality tv if they wish. However, where do trained Australian actors go, especially when they are Australian actors of colour? I myself went to America. The only reason for my return to Australia was to monitor the declining health of an ill parent.

The verifiable evidence, which includes studies conducted at the UNSW prove that there is an onscreen race imbalance on our Australian screens. As mentioned above, the overwhelming majority of Australian film and television casts Caucasian actors in lead/main roles - **by default**, unless it is essential to cast an actor of colour due to the storyline correlation. I am requesting that this unfair race imbalance be rectified for lead/main roles via legislative policy to be lawfully upheld at the screen governing Body Corporate - Screen Australia. Meaning, all film and television producers, decision-makers/creators would need to comply or face penalties for breaching the newly created racial equality policies.

To verify that I am a professional Australian actor and have personally experienced the screen issues that are related to my National Cultural Policy Submission, I have provided the following demo reel for your attention:

https://www.imdb.com/video/vi2575155737/?ref_=nm_ov_vi

Sincerely,

Sachin Joab

<https://www.sachinjoab.com>