Submission- Formal Lawful Objection – Digital Records Preservation Policy (2025 Review)

Dear State Records NSW,

I write to formally object to the proposed Digital Records Preservation Policy (to be renamed Accessibility of State Records Over Time) on the grounds that it conflicts with foundational constitutional principles, violates Natural Law, and is being implemented without lawful democratic authority.

While the preservation of public records is essential, this policy, as framed under the State Records Act 1998, is a **statutory directive without lawful consent of the governed**, and therefore invalid where it conflicts with higher constitutional authority.

### Grounds for Objection:

1. **Lack of Democratic Authority**  
   This policy has not been approved by the People through Trial by Jury or lawful referendum. It is the product of statutory enactment, not constitutional law. As such, it lacks the necessary consent of the governed and fails the test of Democracy.
2. **Subordination to Magna Carta 1215**  
   The Commonwealth of Australia Constitution Act 1900 (UK) and all subordinate state legislation, including the State Records Act 1998, derive their validity only when aligned with **Magna Carta 1215**. Any part of this policy that enables record alteration, concealment, or unconsented surveillance of public information is repugnant to Articles 29 and 39, which guarantee due process and preservation of lawful judgment by equals.
3. **Risk of Historical Revisionism**  
   The principles of "migration" and format alteration, even when well-intended, open the door to tampering, revision, and the potential loss of evidentiary integrity. True preservation must mean **unaltered access**, not administrative reformatting based on technological or political trends.

I therefore call for:

* A full **constitutional review** of this policy;
* An **explicit guarantee** that digital record preservation will be governed by immutable principles of Common Law;
* And an assurance that **no future format migration or alteration will be used to restrict public access** or recontextualise original documents.

If this policy is to be implemented, it must be subordinate to the rights of the People, not the convenience of bureaucratic recordkeeping systems.

Furthermore, by lawful precedent, **original physical documents**, including **land title deeds**, must be preserved in their original form and remain the **primary evidence of ownership and legal standing**. Any attempt to render digital copies the sole legal authority over property, birth, marriage, death, or other sovereign matters constitutes **destruction of lawful title** and is **repugnant to Common Law, Natural Law, and the People’s right to retain proof of identity and ownership**. The People are entitled to **hold, present, and defend** their claims using **physical original records**, not merely trust a database managed by administrative decree.

**Yours lawfully,**  
**Chris Mader**  
Constitutional Researcher | Advocate for Lawful Democracy  
Author of multiple formal submissions to NSW and Federal Parliament  
Specialising in Magna Carta 1215, Democracy, Natural Law, and the Sovereignty of the People

**Constitutional Clarification:**  
The Commonwealth of Australia Constitution Act 1900 (UK) is a statute of the British Parliament and holds lawful validity only insofar as it does not conflict with Magna Carta 1215, Natural Law, and the Sovereign Right of the People to rule through Trial by Jury. Any portion of the Act that contradicts these foundational authorities is, by operation of law, void and of no lawful effect. The People do not stand under Parliament — Parliament stands under the Constitution.