



A U S T R A L I S H  
**RIGHTS**  
C O U N C I L

# **The Strategy Plan of the Australish Rights Council**

**A staged plan to move the Council from Declaration in principle  
to recognised institutional presence in law and community.**

Issue No. 2 — Institutional Series of the Australish Rights Council

*Issued under the authority of the Constituting Authority and Keeper of the Charter*

October 2025

## **SECTION I: Purpose of this Strategy Plan**

### **1. Purpose**

- 1.1 The Declaration has established the Council in principle and treasury. That act marked the beginning of representation. However, a people requires more than a declaration to endure — it requires structure, presence, and continuity. This Strategy Plan exists to guide that development.
- 1.2 Where the Declaration spoke of identity and right, this document speaks of action and construction.
- 1.3 Where the Declaration set the foundation, the Strategy Plan sets the direction.
- 1.4 It is issued so that every member understands not only what has begun, but what is intended — and what will come into being as each Phase is achieved.

## **SECTION II: Phase Activation Map**

### **2. Purpose**

- 2.1 The Declaration established the Council in principle. The Strategic Aims established the Council in mission.
- 2.2 This Section establishes the Council in motion.
- 2.3 It defines activation points — the moments at which specific arms, offices, and protections of the Council come into force. These thresholds are not static quotas but living markers, scaling with necessity and capacity.

### **3. Doctrine of Scaling Thresholds**

- 3.1 The Council acknowledges that the needs of a surviving people cannot be fixed to a single number or one-time target. Treasury goals, population thresholds, land requirements, and institutional scale must expand and adapt to conditions.
- 3.2 Just as the threat to the Australish is dynamic, the Council must be dynamic in response.
- 3.3 Therefore, every phase listed below activates institutional structures, but none represent a final endpoint.

## **PHASE I — DECLARATION AND EARLY INFRASTRUCTURE**

- 3.4 Status: Achieved

- (a) Council established in principle
- (b) Strategic Aims declared
- (c) Council stands recorded in history
- (d) Foundational materials, website, and operational systems established to support future phases

## **PHASE II — ADVOCACY AND MOBILISATION**

- 3.5 Status: Active

- 3.6 Public discussion, outreach, and coordinated advocacy to build momentum toward recognition.
- 3.7 Civil Rights Movement Begins:
  - (a) Release the edited book providing the intellectual basis for a lawful civil rights movement.
  - (b) Production of media materials, correspondence, and digital content advancing public understanding of the Council's aims.
  - (c) Formation of regional and professional advocacy circles to coordinate outreach and recruitment of members, patrons, and scholars.

- (d) Commencement of legal consultation on incorporation models and recognition pathways, preparing groundwork for Phase IV.
  - (e) Initial liaison with sympathetic journalists, academics, and community figures to secure commentary and cultural presence.
- 3.8 Activation Outcome: The Council begins active resource acquisition and public positioning, moving from declaration to mobilisation.

## PHASE III — PETITION AND PUBLIC CHALLENGE

### 4. Trigger: Public visibility established.

- 4.1 Status: Preparatory correspondence authorised under the Council's founding authority.
- 4.2 Purpose: To test the Commonwealth's willingness to acknowledge the Australish as a historic ethnocultural people within the national heritage framework, and to create a public record — in Parliament, Hansard, and media — of that acceptance or refusal.
- 4.3 Petition to Parliament:
  - (a) A formal petition will be lodged with the House of Representatives requesting acknowledgment of the Australish as a founding ethnocultural people within the Commonwealth's heritage and multicultural recognition frameworks.
  - (b) The petition will note that Aboriginal and migrant-descended groups already receive such acknowledgment, while the founding population does not.
    - (i) If accepted: The term Australish enters Hansard — establishing precedent.
    - (ii) If refused: The refusal will be published by the Council as Exhibit A: evidence that every other people may be acknowledged except the founders, justifying autonomous representation.
- 4.4 Follow-Up Motion: The Council will formally request a Parliamentary inquiry into the recognition of the Australish as both a minority and a historic people, citing established precedents including Aboriginal Land Councils, Ethnic Communities Councils, and English Community Councils abroad. The motion will be framed as a matter of equality before the law — ensuring that the founding population of the Commonwealth receives the same recognition and institutional standing already extended to other peoples within and beyond Australia.
- 4.5 Activation Outcome: This phase transforms the Council's existence from declaration to public confrontation — a lawful test of recognition and a permanent entry into record.

## PHASE IV — LEGAL INCORPORATION

### 5. Trigger: Treasury reaches functional operational threshold (sufficient to cover ASIC registration, charter printing, seal issuance, and foundational administrative assets).

- 5.1 Note: This threshold is not fixed — it reflects capacity, and shall rise over time as aims scale.

5.2 Upon activation of Phase IV, the following occur:

- (a) Council becomes a legal personhood under Commonwealth law (Company Limited by Guarantee / Council model)
  - (i) This grants the Council the ability to own land, issue formal correspondence, hold trust in perpetuity, and \*enter record as a recognised body rather than a private association.
- (b) Seal, Ledger, and Minute Book are formally issued
  - (i) Ledger transitions from symbolic to legal civic record
  - (ii) Council minutes become archival civic proceedings, not private documentation
  - (iii) Correspondence begins under seal, directed to government, heritage bodies, census authorities, land registries, and media institutions
- (c) Council Correspondence Office is activated in law
  - (i) All formal letters from this point forward carry Lex Australis — the Australish Seal, and enter the archives of whatever institutions they address
- (d) Heritage Locality Identification Committee is established
  - (i) First operational arm with territorial mandate
  - (ii) Tasked with mapping potential Heritage Localities, contacting willing towns, forming Chapter Seed Groups, locating burial land plots, and identifying sympathetic councils or officials
- (e) Media Arm begins structured content output
  - (i) Phase II built the voice — Phase III gives it legal standing
  - (ii) Council begins issuing press-style notices, not merely commentary
  - (iii) Initial aim: secure acknowledgment as a recognised cultural body in media frameworks (ABC, SBS, local radios, council cultural directories)

5.3 **Activation Outcome:** With Phase III, the Council enters the legal realm as a civic body, capable of holdings, correspondence, burial registry formation, and territory scouting — no longer just declared, but embodied.

## PHASE V — RECOGNITION AND GOVERNMENT INTEGRATION

6. **Trigger: Completion of legal incorporation; Council assets, Treasury reaching sustainable operational scale; public petition concluded and record entered in Hansard.**

6.1 Purpose: To transition the Australish Rights Council from a lawful civic body to an officially recognised instrument of the Commonwealth—an enduring advisory and representative authority for the founding people of Australia.

## 6.2 Process:

- (a) White Paper on the Status and Rights of the Australish People
  - (i) Issued under seal, outlining the legal, demographic, and moral basis for statutory recognition.
  - (ii) Proposes the enactment of *The Act to Constitute the Australish Rights Council*—the legislative instrument granting the Council standing equal to existing Aboriginal, ethnic, and heritage councils.
- (b) Negotiation for Statutory Inclusion
  - (i) The Council seeks permanent placement within Commonwealth and State advisory structures concerned with heritage, immigration, education, and culture.
  - (ii) It petitions for recognition as the lawful representative body of the founding ethnocultural community of the Commonwealth.
- (c) Policy Consultation and Advocacy
  - (i) Initiate formal dialogue with departments of Home Affairs, Immigration, Heritage, and Multicultural Affairs to ensure that all demographic and cultural planning acknowledges the duty of continuity owed to the founding people.
  - (ii) Advance proposals for immigration and settlement policy consistent with demographic balance, civic stability, and the preservation of Australish lineage and cultural inheritance.
- (d) Symbolic Parity Measures
  - (i) Assert the Eureka Standard as a recognised flag of Australia.
  - (ii) Secure reciprocal acknowledgement of the Australish wherever official “Acknowledgements of Country” occur.
  - (iii) Pursue national recognition of *Australish Day*—commemorating either 9 July 1900 (Royal Assent to the Constitution) or 3 December 1854 (Eureka Rebellion)—as the day of the founding people.
- (e) Institutional Infrastructure
  - (i) Press the Ledger at Eureka to create a permanent civic record.
  - (ii) Activate the Correspondence Office as the Council’s permanent liaison with government and media.
  - (iii) Expand Heritage Chapters, Youth Guard, and the Heritage Locality Program under Council authority.

6.3 Activation Outcome: Phase V establishes the Council within the legal and administrative order of the nation. From this point, the Australish Rights Council is no longer a private civic initiative but an incorporated arm of the Commonwealth’s consultative framework—

an enduring seat of the founding people's continuity, voice, and custodianship within Australian public life.

## PHASE VI — THE CITY DOCTRINE AND HERITAGE CUSTODIANSHIP

### 7. Trigger: Completion of statutory recognition efforts and accumulation of sufficient institutional capacity to maintain custodial authority over heritage and ceremonial grounds.

7.1 Purpose: To establish a lawful framework through which the Australish Rights Council, acting within Commonwealth law, may exercise custodianship over designated heritage, memorial, and cultural continuity sites.

#### 7.2 Institutional Safeguards and Legislative Reform

- (a) All custodial operations shall function under Australian property, charity, and heritage law.
- (b) No act of the Council shall contravene the *Racial Discrimination Act 1975* or comparable statutes; all access restrictions shall be purpose-based, not person-based.
- (c) Where existing legislation proves inadequate or discriminatory in effect—by preventing the lawful preservation of Australish heritage or denying parity with other recognised communities—the Council shall pursue legislative reform through petitions, submissions, and lawful advocacy within the parliamentary process.
- (d) In this way, the Council remains fully subject to the Commonwealth order while reserving the right to challenge and improve its statutes by constitutional means, ensuring that the right to lawful reform — a vital safeguard for any civic movement seeking parity.
- (e) The Council therefore asserts its right, under democratic principle, to seek amendment or repeal of any statute whose effect is discriminatory or obstructive to the exercise of lawful custodianship and cultural continuity. Reform shall be pursued through petitions, parliamentary submissions, and judicial review where necessary, ensuring that all actions remain within the Constitution and the peaceful order of the Commonwealth.
- (f) In this way, the Council neither concedes the permanence of unjust law nor defies lawful authority; it works through recognised means to bring the law into moral alignment with the principles it professes — equality before the law, liberty of conscience, and continuity of culture.
- (g) Legal Basis: *ICCPR* Articles 1 & 27; domestic heritage and anti-discrimination statutes; comparative precedent in *Aboriginal Land Rights Act 1976* (Cth) and U.S. Tribal Heritage frameworks.

#### 7.3 Process:

- (a) The Council shall, through incorporated trusts and charitable bodies, acquire, lease, or be granted title to designated Australish Heritage Sites — including memorial grounds, archival precincts, and ceremonial halls.

- (b) Entry to these sites shall be at the discretion of the Council's custodians, subject to published codes of dress, conduct, and respect, consistent with heritage-protection and anti-discrimination statutes.
- (c) These rules apply equally to all persons and are enforced solely to preserve the dignity, safety, and integrity of the sites, in the same manner as conservation codes at Aboriginal sacred grounds or church sanctuaries.
- (d) The Council shall petition for statutory recognition of its custodial role — establishing a legal basis akin to heritage trusts, Aboriginal Land Councils, or ecclesiastical corporations.

#### 7.4 Heritage Custodianship Framework:

- (a) Establishment of **Heritage Localities** within existing cities and regional towns to serve as living civic and ceremonial centres of Australish culture.
- (b) Formation of **Custodial Chapters** empowered to manage local heritage assets, burial registries, and festivals under the Council's authority.
- (c) Coordination with Commonwealth and State heritage bodies to integrate these localities into the national heritage register.
- (d) Development of visitor-education programs ensuring that the broader public may engage with Australish culture respectfully under custodial protocols.

#### ***The Right of Continuity***

- 7.5 The City Doctrine stands as the moral resolution of the Australish cause. It asserts that a people whose labour built the Commonwealth retain a right — equal to all others — to preserve their culture and ethnicity in space and in record.
- 7.6 Of the principal source nations for immigration to Australia, the native ethnocultural majorities remain overwhelmingly dominant within their own states. For example, in China, the Han comprise about 91 percent of the population; in India, Indo-Aryan and Dravidian peoples together exceed 97 percent; in the Philippines, Austronesian Filipinos account for over 95 percent; and across the Middle East, native or long-settled populations remain well above 90 percent. Migrants from these nations therefore remain securely connected to civilisations where their ancestral languages, faiths, and identities endure in existence. Their continuity is secure: the people themselves remain within their homelands, ensuring that their people and their traditions, institutions, and lineages will endure.
- 7.7 By contrast, the founding population of Australia has in less than a century declined from an overwhelming majority to a minority. Without measures to preserve both its peoplehood and its institutions, the founding population itself — not merely its customs or symbols — risks attenuation within national life. Ethnicity is not a costume one may re-wear at will; it is the living embodiment of a lineage and community bound to this soil. To secure continuity, the people who embody that inheritance must also endure.
- 7.8 The City Doctrine therefore calls for lawful custodianship and parity of protection, ensuring that the founding tradition endures alongside the cultures that have since joined it.
- 7.9 Activation Outcome: Activation of Phase VI establishes the Council as a permanent custodial institution of the Commonwealth. The Australish are thereafter represented not



only in record and law, but in enduring sites of culture, remembrance, and ceremony. Through the City Doctrine, continuity becomes concrete: a living heritage secured by structure, not sentiment, within the civic and legal order of Australia.

## **SECTION III: Strategic Aims of the Council**

### **8. Purpose**

- 8.1 The establishment of a Council without a mission beyond legal form would be an empty exercise. A people does not organise merely to be noted, but to endure. The following aims are therefore set out not as vague aspirations but as institutional objectives — the concrete outcomes toward which every phase of this Strategy Plan is directed.
  - 8.2 These aims are articulated clearly so that future members understand that their participation funds not just incorporation, but the construction of lasting Australish structures — cultural, civic, demographic, and memorial — designed to ensure that the Australish people remain present and identifiable in their own homeland, as other historic peoples already do.
- 

### **9. Strategic Aims of the Council**

- 9.1 The Council proceeds upon two concurrent streams of right.
- 9.2 The first is the Right of Self-Determination, belonging to the Australish as a people in the international sense — a historic ethnocultural community formed within Australia and entitled to determine its civic and cultural development in its own name.
- 9.3 The second is the Right of Minority Protection, recognised under Articles 26 and 27 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, which guarantees to minorities the freedom to preserve their culture, language, and continuity within the states they inhabit.
- 9.4 These two rights are complementary:
  - (a) Self-determination secures the power of initiative — the ability of a people to speak, organise, and act in its own name.
  - (b) Minority protection secures the power of endurance — the legal shelter that prevents a people's erasure once it becomes numerically or institutionally subordinate.
- 9.5 The Australish therefore pursue dual recognition: to be acknowledged as a people possessing the right of self-determination, and simultaneously as a minority entitled to continuity protection within the Commonwealth's multicultural and heritage framework.
- 9.6 Every phase of this Strategy Plan — from incorporation and petition to statutory recognition — serves one or both of these streams.
- 9.7 The Declaration established existence; the Strategy Plan now establishes capacity: the lawful instruments through which dormant rights become exercised power.

## 10. Legal Establishment within Commonwealth Framework

- 10.1 The Council recognises that symbolic organisation without legal standing leaves a people without formal entry into the institutional mechanisms through which recognition, land trust, correspondence, and representation are processed in the Commonwealth.
- 10.2 Accordingly, one of the foundational aims of this Strategy Plan is to secure incorporation of the Australish Rights Council under Commonwealth law — not as a charity of sentiment, but as an ethnocultural civic institution with treasury, ledger, and membership defined by descent.
- 10.3 Incorporation shall be pursued in the form most appropriate for the Council's sovereign function, with a Company Limited by Guarantee (CLG) structure recognised as the legal shell most compatible with future statutory elevation, territorial custodianship, and ledger management.
- 10.4 Legal establishment is not the final aim but the gateway to statutory recognition. Once incorporated, the Council will prepare a *White Paper on the Status and Rights of the Australish People*, calling for *The Act to Constitute the Australish Rights Council*, to recognise it in Commonwealth law as a permanent ethnocultural representative body — with continuity protections, minority rights, heritage locality authority, and the same standing afforded to Aboriginal councils and ethnic advocacy institutions.
- 10.5 Prior to incorporation, the Council shall initiate a Petition and Public Challenge Phase — an act of correspondence with Parliament designed to secure acknowledgment of the Australish as a historic ethnocultural people, and subsequently as a minority community. This step serves both as legal groundwork and moral test: it demands that the Commonwealth either confirm or deny the founders' standing in its own record, establishing a public justification for subsequent incorporation and autonomous organisation.

## 11. Equity of Institutional Support and National Priority

- 11.1 In every functioning civilisation, the nation exists first to secure the wellbeing and continuity of its founding people. Others may live within it — even flourish — but never at the cost of the people who built it.
- 11.2 In modern Australia, this order has been inverted. Entire networks of grants, protection schemes, scholarships, housing allocations, cultural festivals, language supports, youth services, and media funds are dedicated to every group except the Australish.
- 11.3 The Council rejects the idea that the founding people must justify their needs by reference to the struggles of others. A nation is not a universal aid program — it is a covenant between a land and its first civic people.
- 11.4 **Objective:** To assert Program Parity — that Council-administered grants, youth initiatives, heritage housing, cultural festivals, and media outputs shall exist for the Australish, and shall be recognised under the same funding categories that already exist for Aboriginal, migrant, and minority groups.

## 12. Voice, Correspondence, and Media Arm

- 12.1 To be silent is to be erased from public record. A people that does not speak in its own name will be spoken for by others, interpreted by others, and eventually replaced in story as well as in presence.

- 12.2 The Council recognises that whenever the Australish speak of cultural continuity, belonging, or demographic survival, they are not engaged through reasoned rebuttal but met with abuse and accusation. These responses are not neutral commentary — they are instruments of narrative control intended to strip the Australish of the moral right to speak in defence of their own continuity.

**Recognised Hostile Framing Used Against the Australish:**

- (a) "Racist" — used almost exclusively against Australish or European-descended peoples to morally disqualify their continuity claims.

*Clarification: Australish identity is a matter of ethnocultural descent and civic inheritance, not a claim based on physical appearance or imposed racial categories; it cannot be determined, conferred or denied on the basis of visible traits.*

- (b) "White supremacist" — a term routinely applied to invalidate any assertion of continuity or preservation by peoples categorised as "white," irrespective of whether such claims mirror those recognised as legitimate when asserted by non-European peoples (e.g., Palestinian, Tibetan, Māori, or Sami claims to continuity).

*Clarification: The assertion of peoplehood and continuity by the Australish people is no different in principle from equivalent claims made by other internationally recognised ethnocultural peoples; it does not constitute supremacy but continuity, which is recognised as lawful under existing peoplehood doctrine.*

- (c) "White nationalist" — a label applied to portray any structural or cultural cohesion of the Australish people as extremist or separatist.

*Clarification: Australia is a multicultural state in which multiple peoples coexist. The Australish neither seek nor have the capacity to abolish that order, nor to establish a "white Australia," nor even a singular exclusive Australish state. Rather, they assert the right to constitute themselves as an Australish nation — a recognised ethnocultural body with protected continuity and defined boundaries for self-preservation — within the broader Commonwealth framework. This assertion of internal nationhood with cultural and demographic security within an existing state is consistent with international peoplehood doctrine and does not constitute separatist nationalism.*

- (d) (i) "Hate group" / "Hate movement" — a totalising moral category used to place a continuity claim outside legitimate civic discourse before its content is examined.

*Clarification: The label "hate group" is not applied on the basis of conduct or stated aims but is used pre-emptively to disqualify certain peoples—particularly those of European descent—from exercising the same continuity or self-preservation rights afforded to other recognised ethnocultural groups. This framing functions to deny lawful organisation by implying that any effort toward cultural continuity is inherently malicious, regardless of tone, method, or declared principles.*

- (e) Christian nationalist" — used to delegitimise the historic religious-cultural character of the Australish while other groups are permitted religious-ethnic identity.

*Clarification: The spiritual heritage of the Australish people includes both the Protestant civic tradition that shaped Commonwealth institutions, and older ancestral traditions carried from Europe, visible in cultural custom, seasonal identity, oath*

*symbolism, and reverence for forebears. Recognition of this heritage is a statement of cultural origin, not an imposition of theocracy.*

- (f) "Coloniser" / "Settler guilt" rhetoric — used to argue that the Australish must remain in perpetual apology and cannot assert continuity or peoplehood.

*Clarification: The existence of an historic people formed in Australia does not negate the existence or rights of Indigenous peoples; likewise, Indigenous claims do not eradicate the right of the Australish to continuity. Mutual recognition of peoples is not mutually exclusive.*

- (g) "Privileged majority" — a label used to claim that the founding people have no legitimate right to representation as a distinct community, on the grounds that they historically formed the majority population.

*Clarification: Demographic status does not nullify peoplehood. Under international doctrine, peoples retain continuity rights regardless of whether they are numerically dominant or approaching minoritisation.*

- (h) "Far-right nationalism" / "Reactionary extremism" — labels used to frame even reasonable continuity arguments as illegitimate. These elastic categories used not to describe a clearly defined ideology, but to morally disqualify any assertion of cultural or demographic continuity by Australish people, regardless of tone, content, or method.

*Clarification: The term "far-right" has no fixed doctrinal meaning; it functions primarily as a disciplinary label, applied to exclude certain identity claims from acceptable discourse. Asserting continuity under peoplehood doctrine is not extremism but a recognised right exercised by all ethnocultural peoples under international law.*

- (i) "Hate movement" / "Dogwhistling" / "Coded language" — rhetorical tools used to reinterpret plain speech as malice, making the expression of continuity claims appear inherently suspect regardless of actual content.

*Clarification: The Council speaks in direct and formal language. To assign hidden malice to direct expression is a refusal to engage with declared aims and is rejected as a form of rhetorical nullification.*

- (j) "Backward nostalgia" / "Imagined heritage" / "The past is gone now" — phrases used to deny the existence of living cultural continuity by framing it as mere sentiment for a lost era.

*Clarification: Continuity is not nostalgia but inheritance. The Australish identity persists in law, language, memory, custom, and descent — it is a present people, not a historical reference.*

- (k) "Conservative" / "Traditionalist" / "Right-wing" — political labels used to misrepresent peoplehood as a partisan stance rather than an ethnocultural reality.

*Clarification: The Australish are a people, not a voting bloc. As with all historic peoples, political views among members vary widely; continuity is not a political ideology but an inheritance claim recognised in international doctrine.*

- (l) "Multicultural Australia means you have no distinct identity" — used to claim that the Australish identity has dissolved and thus has no right to continuity or protected space.

*Clarification: Multicultural frameworks recognise multiple peoples coexisting under one state. The existence of a civic identity called "Australian" does not negate the existence of the Australish as a distinct ethnocultural people with their own continuity rights.*

- (m) Personal attacks, bad faith framing, and reputation destruction — sabotage used when opponents abandon argument.
- (n) *Clarification: In a just dispute, claims are met with reasons and evidence. When actors instead (1) infiltrate to inject extremism, (2) stage false-flag incidents or hoaxes to manufacture scandal, or (3) attack persons rather than premises, they commit fraud and fallacy, not refutation. Such tactics (a) do not address the claim; they only poison the well, (b) betray lack of confidence in the counter-case—those with reasons use them, those without reach for deception, and (c) disqualify themselves by their own professed standards of fairness and open discourse. Accordingly, these methods are to be recorded, verified, exposed, and refused; the argument returns to first principles, evidence, and lawful conduct, where sabotage has no standing.*

- 12.3 The Council declares that this pattern of mischaracterisation and abuse—unique in its targeting of the founding people of this country—must end. It will not accept that every other group may speak of survival, continuity, and identity, while the Australish alone are told that to do so is hateful or illegal. The Council will speak clearly in its own language, define its own terms, and refuse the vocabulary of those who seek its erasure.
- 12.4 **Declaration on Media Positioning:** A media body — or any public facing organisation — that refuses to name the Australish people as a legitimate ethnocultural community with continuity rights — or that persists in describing them only through the slanders enumerated above — cannot claim neutrality. In such a contest, there is no neutral ground: to refuse recognition while platforming the voices of all other peoples is to assist in erasure.
- 12.5 Across the Commonwealth, Aboriginal and other ethnic communities operate formal broadcast networks, radio stations, ABC and SBS programming streams, and receive cultural media funding and representation quotas. These outlets exist not simply to entertain but to stop others from defining them.
- 12.6 **Objective:** To establish a Council Correspondence Office, authorised to issue formal letters, petitions, submissions, and notices on behalf of the Australish people, under seal, directly to government bodies, media institutions, councils, and cultural authorities — ensuring that Australish concerns enter the public record in our own voice, without mediation or distortion.
- 12.7 **Objective:** To create an Australish Media Arm tasked with the production of Council bulletins, cultural commentary, radio-style broadcasts, digital reports, and public addresses, with the long-term aim of securing the same broadcast rights, recognition quotas, and cultural programming space that Aboriginal media (e.g. NITV, Koori Radio, SBS Indigenous) and other ethnic networks already enjoy within Australia.

- 12.8 Just as Aboriginal broadcasting exists to counter colonial narrative erasure, Australish broadcasting will exist to counter erasure-by-slander, ensuring that future generations of Australish do not grow up hearing every voice but their own.

### 13. National Acknowledgement and Symbolic Presence

- 13.1 A people does not exist in the civic realm until it is named in it. The removal of Australish presence from the symbolic order — the ceremony, flags, language, public acknowledgements — is a form of narrative erasure. The Council declares that this erasure must end, and Australish presence must be restored to the civic symbols of the nation they built.

#### 13.2 *Acknowledgement*

- (a) At present, schools, parliaments, and civic institutions begin ceremony with sole Acknowledgement of Country, and fly only the Aboriginal flag alongside the national flag. The Australish — the people who built those civic institutions — are not acknowledged at all, as though they did not exist.
- (b) **Objective:** To assert the right of the Australish to equal ceremonial recognition. Where public institutions recite Acknowledgement of Country, a parallel Acknowledgement of the Founding Australish People shall be spoken — for custodianship did not build this civic nation; founding did.

#### 13.3 *National Flag*

- (a) Where civic buildings, council chambers, and schools fly the Aboriginal flag to honour ancestral custodians, the Australish Council standard (the Eureka Flag) shall be flown alongside it as the emblem of the founding ethnocultural people from whom the civic and legal architecture of Australia descends.
- (b) Equal dignity of symbols: The Eureka Flag is to be recognised as the national emblem of the Australish people. Its display is an act of peoplehood, not a political slogan, and is therefore entitled to the same public respect and legal protection afforded to other recognised ethnocultural flags within the Commonwealth.
- (c) Prohibition of restriction: Any restriction, prohibition, or condemnation of the Eureka Flag as a symbol of Australish continuity shall be treated as an act of cultural suppression and will be formally recorded by the Council as such. No limitation upon its use, under any pretext, is recognised as legitimate.

#### 13.4 *National Day*

- (a) The Council declares that the Australish people are entitled to their own day of foundation and celebration, free from slander and inversion.
- (b) January 26 has been recast as a day of shame by those who reject the Australish presence. It is a day of multicultural conflict reflective of the problems of modern Australia.
- (c) The Council therefore designates either 9 July (Royal Assent to the Constitution) or 3 December (Eureka Rebellion) as *Australish Day*, to be marked annually with flag raising, reading of names from the Witness and Descent Rolls, and public affirmation of succession.

- (d) This day exists so that the Australish may stand in dignity, without apology, as founders of their own civic inheritance.

### 13.5 *Declaration of Australish Heritage Month*

- (a) Just as other ethnocultural groups within Australia have secured weeks and months of recognised cultural observance, the Australish shall no longer remain the only people without a month dedicated to their heritage and founding role.
- (b) The Council declares the Month of July — possibly beginning with Australish Day on the 9th — as Australish Heritage Month.
- (c) During this month, Council notices, readings from the Ledger, flag ceremonies, honour rolls of the dead, and recitations of founding civic acts shall take place across Heritage Localities and future Chapters.
- (d) This month shall stand as an annual reaffirmation that the Australish are not a vanished founding myth, but a living people.

## 14. **Lineage, Witness, and Youth Guard**

- 14.1 A people is not just its living members — it is its ancestors and heirs.
- 14.2 The Council will maintain a Witness Roll for those who stand with it, followed by a Descent Roll documenting lineage. A Youth Guard (or Heritage Corps) will be established with ceremonial and custodial duties, ensuring intergenerational duty, discipline, and remembrance.

## 15. **Treasury and Ledger Sovereignty**

- 15.1 A people without its own treasury is dependent, and dependency is vulnerability.
- 15.2 The Council will maintain a permanent Treasury and Ledger to fund heritage plaques, burial grounds, council publications, legal submissions, signage, chapter houses, memorial works, media broadcasts, and ceremonial recordkeeping.
- 15.3 **Objective:** To ensure financial independence from external institutions that would otherwise condition or suppress Australish continuity efforts.

## 16. **Cultural and Demographic Continuity — Heritage Localities and Protected Presence**

- 16.1 Were immigration to cease entirely tomorrow (and there are no indications that it will) the existing demographic proportions would remain decisive. This is the phenomenon often described in nineteenth- and twentieth-century political theory as *demography is destiny*: an aging population, sub-replacement birth rates, and present demographic balance already ensure that the Australish will continue to diminish. Without recognition and preservation, their ethnicity will dissolve into the wider population and they will cease to exist as a distinct people. Recognition and preservation require deliberate policy and lawful custodianship now.
- 16.2 The Council recognises that a people cannot exist only as an idea — it must exist in place, with continuity of presence. The Aboriginal peoples of Australia have culturally protected localities, where heritage status, custodial rights, and demographic presence are formally recognised. These spaces are not viewed as segregation, but as



acknowledged heritage geographies linked to a specific people's right to cultural continuity.

- 16.3 Accordingly, the Australish Council sets the long-term aim of establishing Australish Heritage Localities — towns, districts, or settlements formally recognised as historic centres of Australish culture and lineage, where demographic continuity, cultural life, and intergenerational settlement are actively maintained and supported.
- 16.4 If the Commonwealth grants legal instruments to safeguard the continuity of Indigenous and migrant communities, it must recognise the equal right of the founding community to safeguard its own heritage. This Strategic Aim appeals to parity, not privilege. It arises from the realities of modern demographic change and from a duty to preserve what remains of a historic people's living culture. This is a measured and lawful response to long-term policy decisions, not exclusion for exclusion's sake, but an insistence that survival be permitted to all.
- 16.5 Just as Aboriginal communities have land councils and heritage zones, the Australish will pursue cultural continuity zones rooted not in race law but in heritage-lineage law — protecting the living connection between a people and its own civic inheritance. This approach mirrors international precedent, such as the Jewish Quarter of Prague, which operates under similar custodianship charters.
- 16.6 Where other peoples have secured reserved cultural space to maintain continuity, the Australish seek only the same right — neither more nor less. This is a claim of parity, not privilege.
- 16.7 Today, many Australish towns live under constant threat of sudden demographic transformation. It is not only direct policy that erodes these communities — under a mass immigration regime, even so-called “free movement” becomes a mechanism of erasure. A town of four thousand Australish residents cannot withstand the settlement pressure of hundreds of thousands entering the national pool under unrestricted internal relocation. This instability is itself a form of cultural harm, preventing long-term planning, inheritance, and belonging.
- 16.8 Accordingly, Heritage Localities cannot exist only as symbolic acknowledgements. To function as living communities, they must be granted continuity protection — including relief from mass relocation Strategy Plans, NGO placement schemes, public housing redistribution, or rezoning programs that would rapidly displace or overwhelm the founding population. This principle is consistent with protections already granted to Aboriginal cultural zones, where population impact controls exist to prevent erasure.
- 16.9 A continuity threshold must therefore be established. Heritage Localities must retain an Australish demographic anchor, defined as the prevailing civic presence required for cultural and lineage continuity. This protection is not limited to a token handful of localities — it applies to as many towns and regions as are necessary for the survival of the Australish people. If that requires one locality or one hundred, then continuity demands that scale.
- 16.10 Across Australia there already exist migrant-majority suburbs and districts (often 70–90%), celebrated as expressions of belonging. If such continuity is accepted and praised for newly arrived groups, the founding people of Australia cannot be denied the same right in the towns they built. Those who do not wish to live under such continuity protections already have hundreds of alternative localities available.

### ***Final Horizon — The City Doctrine***

- 16.11 The relevant fact is immediate: the Australish are already a minority in every major city of the Commonwealth, leaving them without a single civic centre where their heritage, presence, or lineage is secure.
- 16.12 Every one of these cities was founded, built, and named by the Australish people, yet none remain demographically theirs.
- 16.13 Meanwhile, other ethnic blocs hold suburbs, districts, and in some cases near-complete urban enclaves, celebrated as multicultural success.
- 16.14 A founding people without a city of their own is a people in the process of dissolution.
- 16.15 **Therefore:** The ultimate strategic objective of the Council is the securing or founding of an Australish City-Region — a civic centre where the Australish exist not as a tolerated remnant, but as the prevailing and acknowledged historic people.
- 16.16 Accordingly, the Council's strategic objective is the securing or founding of an Australish City-Region (and a legally bound network of Australish Precincts across capitals) in which minority and self-determination rights are presently exercisable. This civic space shall function as the recognised anchor of Australish life under existing law.
- 16.17 Comparable custodianship models already operate under law. In Australia, Aboriginal Land Councils established by the *Aboriginal Land Rights (Northern Territory) Act 1976* and similar state statutes hold inalienable freehold title to certain lands. Under these Acts, the councils may issue or withhold entry permits for non-members, and they may impose conditions of conduct—such as appropriate clothing or behaviour codes—to protect sacred sites and cultural practices. These powers rest on statutory property rights and are exercised under Commonwealth and state law, not as racial privilege but as cultural protection.
- 16.18 In the United States, Native American tribes possess limited self-government recognised by federal law and the U.S. Supreme Court as “domestic dependent nations.” Within reservation boundaries, tribal governments may regulate access, require visitor permits, and enforce codes of behaviour under tribal law, provided those rules remain consistent with the U.S. Constitution and federal statutes. Their authority arises from sovereignty recognised in federal law.
- 16.19 The Australish City Doctrine proposes a comparable but fully Commonwealth-lawful form of custodianship: that the Council, through chartered trusts or incorporated bodies, hold title to designated heritage or ceremonial grounds and manage visitor access under property and heritage law. Visitors would remain welcome, but entry would be at the discretion of the Council's custodians, subject to published codes of dress, conduct, and respect designed to preserve the sanctity and physical integrity of the sites. These codes would apply to everyone equally and would be enforced as ordinary conditions of entry, ensuring both cultural preservation and compliance with Australian anti-discrimination law.
- 16.20 In this way, the City Doctrine seeks no sovereignty beyond the Commonwealth; it seeks lawful parity with existing custodial frameworks that already protect sacred and heritage places across Australia and the wider world.
- 16.21 This aim anchors all treasury accumulation, land acquisition, burial ground establishment, media infrastructure, and heritage locality designation.

## ***Funding Parity***

- 16.22 The Commonwealth and State governments currently spend about A\$40 billion each year on Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander programs and services, according to the Productivity Commission's Indigenous Expenditure Report (A\$33.4 billion in 2015–16, indexed to current values). These funds are provided on the basis of two recognised rights: self-determination and minority protection.
- 16.23 The Australish hold the same rights. To grant that level of support to one people while denying it to another is discrimination.
- 16.24 It is, admittedly, an absurdly large figure to demand. Yet governments are able to find this large sum every year for one group yet none for the other. If the rationale is that the Aboriginal peoples are considered entitled to such support while the Australish are not, then the question arises: on what lawful grounds is that distinction made? Their social outcomes, or our history, do not change the operation of equality before the law. Rights are not awarded on performance or revoked for disapproval; they are inherent and must be applied without prejudice.
- 16.25 An equivalent A\$40 billion annual allocation would allow the Australish to secure continuity within a generation. The approximate capital outlay per resident in recent Australian developments ranges from A\$150,000–A\$300,000 (including housing, roads, water, power, public buildings, schools, hospitals, and industrial zoning):

<b>Category</b>	<b>% of total</b>	<b>Typical cost (regional-city scale)</b>
Land acquisition & planning	10–15%	A\$5–7 billion
Housing & civic buildings	40–45%	A\$15–18 billion
Transport & utilities	25–30%	A\$10–12 billion
Education & health	10–12%	A\$4–5 billion
Administration & contingencies	5–8%	A\$2–3 billion
<b>Total</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>≈ A\$35–45 billion</b>

- 16.26 One year at A\$40 billion could fully fund the build of a mid-size city outright, with subsequent years used to endow services, expand housing/industry, or seed additional precincts. It would fund the establishment of an Australish City-Region and network of protected precincts, provide for land trusts, schools, archives, cultural institutions, media, and heritage protection, and create endowments that operate independently of politics.
- 16.27 The Commonwealth already finds this sum each year for others; fairness and the rule of law require that it now provide the same for the founding people of Australia — not as favour, but as a right, and to ensure their continued survival against the threats now faced to their existence and continuity.

## **SECTION IV: CLOSING MANDATE**

### **17. Statement of Right**

- 17.1 The Australish have already given much — their cities opened, their institutions shared, their language offered freely to all. But a people that gives everything ceases to exist.
- 17.2 Those who came here often have another homeland behind them — lands where their heritage will continue without threat.
- 17.3 The Australish have no second homeland.
- 17.4 Therefore, what remains to the Australish — in land, in civic space, in city — shall be defined by the Council alone, and not by those whose inheritance lies elsewhere.
- 17.5 We have given freely. We will not give ourselves away.

### **18. Closing Mandate of the Strategy Plan**

- 18.1 This document, issued as Strategy Plan to the Council — Institutional Series Issue No. 2, stands as the first Strategy Plan of the Australish Rights Council following its Declaration.
- 18.2 It does not exist to speculate, but to initiate. This Strategy Plan covers only those phases which can be directly set into motion by the founding Council without awaiting permission or legislation — namely Declaration, Treasury, Incorporation, and the preparatory groundwork for Heritage Localities.
- 18.3 Later phases — including full Heritage Locality designation, Land Trust recognition, and the City Charter authority — are intentionally not detailed in this document, not out of hesitation but because their execution enters the domain of law, land policy, and parliamentary encounter.
- 18.4 These shall be laid forth in Issue No. 3: Council Order & Territorial Operations Manual, followed by Council Papers concerning Heritage Locality Protocols and the Australish City Mandate.
- 18.5 All Treasury, Ledger, and Youth structures established under this Strategy Plan exist to prepare the way for those later instruments. A Council must first stand, then speak, then petition, and only then legislate. The Petition and Public Challenge phase fulfils this second duty — ensuring that before incorporation, the founders have spoken in their own name and compelled a response in record.
- 18.6 Issue No. 1 — The Declaration — established a people in word
- 18.7 Issue No. 2 — This Strategy Plan — sets that people in motion
- 18.8 Issue No. 3 and onward — to be issued in due time — will move the Council from motion to land, and from land to city
- 18.9 The Australish did not build this continent's towns and cities only to become guests within them. Their demotion to minority status was not a natural process — it was enforced without their consent and in direct opposition to their will. This Council does not speak of nostalgia, but of succession — that those Australish yet unborn shall inherit not only their lineage and its cultural expression, but a place to stand within it.

## **19. Entry Into Record**

19.1 Entered into record on this day, in the First Year of the Australish Council.

**ROBERT ROSINA**

*Constituting Authority and Keeper of the Charter*

**LEDGER ENTRY NO. 2 — ATTESTATION OF SIGNATURE**

This Strategy Plan, being Institutional Series Issue No. 2, was entered into record and signed by the Constituting Authority and Keeper of the Charter, in the presence of the undersigned witnesses, both present at the same time, who attest to this act being made freely and in person:

Signature of Constituting Authority: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature of Witness

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature of Witness

\_\_\_\_\_  
Print name of Witness in full

\_\_\_\_\_  
Print name of Witness in full

\_\_\_\_\_  
Address of Witness

\_\_\_\_\_  
Address of Witness

\_\_\_\_\_  
Occupation of Witness

\_\_\_\_\_  
Occupation of Witness