

AGENDA 21: ENDING THE DECEPTION & MOVING FORWARD

**The Choice is Clear: Continue to Surrender Australia as Required by
AG21;
or,
Reclaim Australia's Democracy, Sovereignty & Prosperity**

**Graham Williamson
March 2013
(Revised)**

As Paul Driessen stated so well: "Climate alarmism and pseudo-science have justified all manner of regulations, carbon trading, carbon taxes, renewable energy programs and other initiatives that increase the cost of everything we make, grow, ship, eat, heat, cool, wear and do – and thus impair job creation, economic growth, living standards, health, welfare and ecological values."

Mary Kay Barton, [New York's 'Sustainability' Plan: aka 'Agenda 21'](#)

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

It is the purpose of this paper to further consolidate the facts pertaining to implementation of Agenda 21 in Australia, to assess the democratic basis of this implementation, and to chart a way forward which reflects traditional Australian values of democracy, freedom to choose, and preservation of national sovereignty.

Based upon the extensive government and legal documentation cited in this paper the following facts are confirmed.

1. **Agenda 21 is a foreign pervasive program which has been designed by, and is monitored by, the United Nations.** Implementation of AG21 therefore involves surrendering control, sovereignty, and human rights, to the UN.
2. **Agenda 21 and associated imported sustainability programs are shown to have been implemented extensively and pervasively, and by both major political parties and by all 3 levels of Government in every state of Australia for nearly 20 years.** AG21 has penetrated from Canberra to local communities everywhere. It shapes our legal system, our economic system, our environmental system, our political system, and even the education of our children.
3. **All major political parties have shown a consistent determination to implement Agenda 21 as undeclared or covert policy.** Over a 20 year period both major political parties have opted to continue implementing AG21 while omitting it from the electoral agenda. As a result, community ignorance about AG21 and its implications are widespread. **This refusal to inform Australians and enable them to make an informed electoral choice constitutes a deliberate attack on democracy and the freedom to choose. Implementation of Agenda 21 is based upon a failure to accurately and truthfully inform Australians. It is based upon deception and trashing of democracy.**
4. Responsibility for undemocratic implementation of Agenda 21 is spread across all three levels of government. **Although councils are at the front line when it comes to implementing many aspects of AG21, councils are coerced and controlled by state governments which in turn respond to pressure from international agreements signed by Canberra.**
5. The general attitude of our political representatives to Agenda 21, far from seeking to sing the praises of the program, is characterised by extreme evasiveness, dismissiveness, denial, or even ridicule, of anyone even mentioning it. The goal or end result of this attitude is to prevent debate and prevent Australians from being able to make an informed democratic choice. **The expectation that a fair, just, and sustainable society could be built upon betrayal, and treachery, indicates just how far the thought processes of some elites may deviate from reality.**

When it comes to moving forward with positive reforms to protect against the threat posed by Agenda 21 to individual freedom and human rights and the threat to Australia's national security and sovereignty, there are two clear options.

1. **Because of the immediacy of the threat AG21 poses to basic human rights and national security, immediate legislative action is required to ban all related foreign, imported, or AG21 derived sustainability programs. Covertly**

surrendering control to foreign agencies is totally unacceptable and represents a serious attack on Australia's national sovereignty and security. Urgent proactive measures are needed to prevent such an anti-Australian sell out. Indeed, such action has already commenced in America where various authorities are now moving to ban Agenda 21.

2. When it comes to Agenda 21 and Agenda 21 derived sustainability programs, as soon as possible, at the next Commonwealth, State, or local election, **the people must be correctly and fully informed and given a genuine democratic choice. There is no justification for continuing to implement AG21 while deliberately excluding it from the electoral agenda to prevent freedom of choice and subvert democracy.**

It is clearly time to move forward with decisive and positive action and ignore the **flat earthers and deniers (ie. those who pretend AG21 is not being implemented)** who defend and perpetuate the removal of democratic choice when it comes to Agenda 21. While there is no doubt that many are completely ignorant of AG21, and others have a very limited understanding of the total agenda, there is also no doubt that many politicians and those driven by personal or ideological agendas deliberately seek to deny or distort the facts or spread misinformation about AG21.

The facts, as sourced from extensive government sources, are clear and beyond sensible dispute. **But how many politicians or members of the mainstream media have conveyed these facts to the public?** And how many have attempted to dismiss and discourage any discussion of these simple facts or even go so far as to belittle people who do no more than simply ask questions?

Remember their names.

Australia desperately needs more competent and honest people in Parliament. Australia is currently being destroyed by a combination of political incompetence and deception and divisive politicians dedicated to their own self-interest and/or anti-Australian global interests. Such incompetence or deliberate deception has no place in public office. Any system constructed on foundations of incompetence or deception is the very antithesis of 'sustainability'.

Those who accept the facts and endorse positive values of political honesty, democracy, personal freedom, and national independence and prosperity, are already moving forward with policies to reflect these values and ban opposing destructive policies (ie in America). **Moves to re-establish freedom and democracy and ban Agenda 21 are beginning to flourish and Australia must make sure it is not left behind.**

Australia has the opportunity to be leading the world and showing the way forward when it comes to reforms to ensure democratic freedom and national independence. Instead, we are being dragged in exactly the opposite direction by self-serving, introspective, backward thinking politicians who continue to force the whole country to suffer as they desperately chase their bizarre anti-Australian ideological dreams.

Public officials who deliberately seek to trash traditional Australian values, remove private property rights, destroy Australian sovereignty, independence and prosperity, while at the same time deliberately preventing Australians from making an informed

democratic choice, have no place in public office falsely masquerading as public servants and fraudulently using public funds. Those who base their political survival upon deception and subversion of democracy, to conceal their abhorrent policies and abandonment of the people, must be exposed to the full light of truth and the full extent of the law.

The Dishonesty Epidemic: the art of double dealing & political dealing

When our politicians and public officials consistently and deliberately deny the truth then we are on the slippery slope to democratic decay and social disorder. There is no doubt that a social and political system based upon deliberate deception is not just unsustainable, it is the pathway to tyranny and the end of the fundamental values upon which democracy is based. Democracy is about being able to make an informed choice. Deception and tyranny are about removing that ability. **The expectation that a fair, just, and sustainable society could be built upon betrayal, and treachery, indicates just how far the thought processes of some elites may deviate from reality.**

Deliberate deception begins with so called 'spin' and misuse or corruption of language. **According to [Robert Todd Carroll](#):**

"Some people are often intentionally unclear. They use language to conceal the truth, to mislead, confuse, or deceive us. They do not use language to communicate ideas or feelings; they use it to control thought and behaviour. Manipulation, not communication, is their goal."

This matter has been dealt with in some detail by Ben Grono in "[The Corruption of Language](#)":

"The way that the language of contemporary politics is misused to deceive us and obscure reality mirrors Orwell's imagined future in which truth and honesty are absent from political discourse..... In Politics and the English Language, Orwell was most critical of vague and incompetent political language that concealed reality by tending away from concrete meaning. This language - weasel words, stale metaphors, managerial buzz words, pretentious diction and other meaningless phrases - continues to proliferate in contemporary political discourse. Seeking a shield against attack, public figures instinctively use ambiguous expressions, described as weasel words, to complicate meaning..... Our growing awareness of the natural environment on which we depend has spurred the creation of the most recent set of buzz words and meaningless terms. The most notorious of these words—often labelled as astro-turfing—are the adjectives 'sustainable' and 'green', which can (and are) applied to any idea or policy in search of support..... Orwell's concern for the corruption of language is justified, and so too is concern for the now contested notion of truth itself. Contemporary political discourse is constantly manipulated and attempts must be made to revive language and meaning in debate. The clear and precise language Orwell argued for is needed in any society where power is shared. Effective communication, the relationship of trust between the governors and the governed, and the ability to recognise dishonesty and incompetence are all reliant on expressive language."

Language is commonly used to destroy democracy by preventing the public from making an informed choice. The use of spin, distortions, and deliberate deceit is creating an undemocratic dream world, controlled by deceit, completely detached from reality. Currently, within Australia and elsewhere, politicians and public officials are obsessed with spin, ambiguity, weasel words, and deliberate deception ([1](#), [2](#), [3](#), [4](#), [5](#), [6](#), [7](#)). While the need to deceive is endemic amongst our political representatives, the consequences of this ongoing deception are continuing to be experienced by the whole community.

Agenda 21 & the Need for Pollies to Conceal the Truth - Observing First Hand the Degree to Which Australian Politicians Have Abandoned Honesty & Democracy

It is said that (8) “looking for an honest politician is like looking for an ethical burglar” and (8) “you cannot adopt politics as a profession and remain honest” and (8) “politicians are, by nature, liars”, or in the words of Donald Boudreaux (8):

“People who seek political power are, with exceptions too rare to matter, never to be trusted; at best, such people are vain and officious busybodies. People who actually achieve political power are to be trusted even less than those who seek it without success; winning elections requires a measure of deceitfulness and Machiavellian immorality that no decent person comes close to possessing.”

While some may say such generalisations are a little harsh, it is certainly true that many politicians make such propositions extremely difficult to disagree with.

One of the most extreme examples of the extraordinary lengths politicians will go to in order to conceal the truth concerns the [United Nations Agenda 21 program](#). AG21 is a UN program adopted by the Keating government in 1992, later ratified by the Howard government, & implemented by successive federal, state & local governments of all political persuasions ever since. In 20 years of implementation, neither of the two major political parties has declared AG 21 as official policy, nor given voters a democratic choice yet AG21 is a foreign program aimed at controlling all aspects of people’s lives, including the elimination of individual human rights such as private property rights ([9](#), [10](#), [11](#), [12](#)).

Since Agenda 21 is a bipartisan policy of 20 years duration amongst all 3 levels of government throughout Australia, clearly it is the most massive policy initiative ever undertaken in the history of Australian Federation. Given this fact it is absolutely astounding, if not criminal, that the public largely remain uninformed and ignorant of the purpose, costs, and end goals, of this policy. The public have only been informed by a “[tokenistic](#)” program if at all. These facts illustrate the degree to which politician’s have abandoned honesty and democracy.

Notwithstanding these simple facts, many politicians seem to have a guilt driven hypersensitivity to the subject of AG21 which may cause them to respond to any mention of this UN program with complete denial. Some may even feel the need to resort to a derogatory or mocking response with claims of ‘conspiracy theorists’. Given the political hypersensitivity to this subject, it is pertinent to review and substantiate some fundamental facts relating to AG21.

Fundamental AG21 Facts Which Politicians Normally Deny to Protect the Guilty

The following facts are predominantly sourced direct from government, politicians, legal experts, UN, or council sources.

1. **Agenda 21 has been implemented around Australia for nearly 20 years by both major political parties and by the Commonwealth, States, and local Councils ([13](#), [14](#), [15](#), [16](#), [17](#), [18](#)).** As a result, all Australian states, including NSW ([19](#), [20](#), [21](#), [22](#), [23](#), [24](#), [25](#), [26](#), [27](#), [28](#), [29](#), [30](#), [31](#), [32](#), [33](#), [34](#), [35](#), [36](#), [37](#), [38](#), [39](#), [40](#), [41](#), [42](#), [43](#), [44](#), [45](#), [46](#), [47](#), [48](#), [49](#), [50](#), [51](#), [52](#), [53](#), [54](#), [55](#), [56](#), [57](#), [58](#), [59](#), [60](#), [61](#), [62](#), [63](#), [64](#), [65](#), [66](#), [67](#), [68](#), [69](#), [70](#), [71](#), [72](#), [73](#), [74](#), [75](#), [76](#)), Queensland ([77](#), [78](#), [79](#), [80](#), [81](#), [82](#), [83](#), [84](#), [85](#), [86](#), [87](#)) Victoria ([88](#), [89](#), [90](#), [91](#), [92](#), [93](#), [94](#), [95](#), [96](#), [97](#), [98](#)), SA ([99](#), [100](#), [101](#), [102](#), [103](#), [104](#), [105](#), [106](#), [107](#)), and WA ([108](#), [109](#), [110](#), [111](#), [112](#), [113](#), [114](#)), proceeded to implement Agenda 21 by changes to state legislation and by

enforcing local changes at the local council level. In fact, so important were local councils in the global plans of the UN that the UN specifically incorporated a section promoting so called 'Local Agenda 21' or 'LA 21' into [Chapter 28 of the Agenda 21 document](#).

Local Agenda 21 has been adopted by Councils around Australia under the guidance of the [Commonwealth Government](#) ([15](#), [192](#), [193](#), [194](#), [195](#), [196](#), [197](#), [198](#), [199](#), [200](#)) the [Australian Local Government Association](#) ([13](#), [14](#)), and the various state governments ([115](#), [59](#), [60](#), [61](#), [62](#), [63](#), [64](#), [65](#), [69](#), [70](#), [71](#), [73](#), [74](#), [75](#), [76](#), [81](#), [82](#), [83](#), [84](#), [85](#), [104](#), [110](#), [111](#), [112](#), [123](#), [124](#), [125](#), [126](#), [127](#), [128](#), [129](#), [130](#), [140](#), [141](#), [142](#), [143](#), [144](#), [152](#), [153](#), [154](#), [155](#), [156](#), [157](#), [158](#), [159](#)). In fact, the [Australian Local Government Association](#) (ALGA), which has [increasingly close links with the Commonwealth Government](#) and is a [member of COAG](#), was one of the original signatories to the [the Intergovernmental Agreement on the Environment](#) in 1992. In 2002 the [Australian Local Government Association](#) reaffirmed their commitment to Agenda 21 in the [Sustaining Our Communities Declaration](#):

*"There remains a pressing need for further action at all levels to be accelerated if the global sustainable development objectives of Agenda 21 are to be realised. The Newcastle Declaration is acknowledged as a starting point. It is **time to move from commitment to action**..... Continuing the implementation of Agenda 21 in our [Local Governments and their communities](#).....Continuing the implementation of Agenda 21 by **establishing partnerships with non-government organisations, business and finance, and education and research institutions**....Continuing the implementation of Agenda 21 by **working as a partner with national, state and territory governments***

In Victoria, the [Municipal Association of Victoria \(MAV\)](#) "established a statewide partnership of councils involved in ecological sustainable development (ESD) /Triple Bottom Line/Local Agenda 21(LA21) initiatives. A successful first meeting of 17 member councils from around the State was held on 15th August 2001 to establish the MAV Victorian Local Sustainability Partnership." And "[By 2001, at least 20 local councils in Victoria](#) "were working towards implementing Local Agenda 21 action plans to help their communities become involved in sustainable development." See also **Bayside Council's 2003 submission to the Commonwealth Government's Inquiry into Sustainable Cities 2025.**

According to a [media release by Senator the Hon Robert Hill](#), the Leader of the Government in the Senate Minister for the Environment and Heritage on 17th July 2001:

"ADELAIDE TO HOST INTERNATIONAL LOCAL AGENDA » « 21 » CONFERENCE Federal Environment Minister Robert Hill today announced Adelaide will host an international conference on sustainable development for local authorities in March 2002.....There is currently LA21 activity in every State and Territory in Australia. A recent survey by the International Council for Local Environmental Initiatives Australia/New Zealand identified 97 Councils in Australia which are engaged in LA21 programs....."In South Australia over 50 per cent of Councils are undertaking an LA21 program with their communities," Senator Hill said.....City of Adelaide Lord Mayor, Alfred Huang, welcomed the selection of Adelaide as host city and said the State has shown an ongoing commitment to LA21....."South Australia's State and Local governments have had a long-term and ongoing commitment to promoting and supporting the uptake of LA21 through the Partnership for Local « Agenda » « 21 »," Lord Mayor Huang said....."

Former Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister for the Environment, **Senator the Hon Ian Macdonald**, in a public symposium forum in Brisbane on 4th April 1998 organised by Logan United Citizens Association and Concerned Residents Action Group, and entitled "**Ecological**

Sustainable Development and Local Agenda 21", [outlined the influence of the Commonwealth upon implementation of AG21](#) at the local level and the [funding provided by the Commonwealth](#):

*"The concept of sustainable development has been with us now since the Rio Earth Summit in 1992, and action has been guided at the international level by Local Agenda 21. At the national level, action has been guided by the 1992 National Strategy for Ecologically Sustainable Development, endorsed by the Commonwealth, State and Territory Governments as well as the Australian Local Government Association..... Commonwealth policies are a catalyst for the development of these dynamic partnerships. The Commonwealth has several initiatives designed to support and provide a catalyst for the development of Local Agenda 21 in Australia....The Environment Resource Officer (ERO) Scheme is operated by the Department of Environment to work in partnership with Local Government. The Scheme funds part of the cost of a dedicated environment officer in a peak Local Government organisation in each State to work with Councils to maximise positive environmental outcomes....Last year we also funded a National Environment Resource Officer to be based in Environs Australia...This ERO scheme is one of the main ways the Commonwealth communicates with and provides information on Commonwealth environmental policies and programmes to Local Government....The Commonwealth has recently changed the work plans of the Environment Resource Officer in response to this upsurge in interest following the Newcastle conference. Promoting and assisting councils to develop and implement Local Agenda 21 is a significant part of the Environment Resource Officer's work plans for the current financial year...In addition, a major task of the National Environment Resource Officer is to provide advice on national themes and options for promoting Local Agenda 21 to councils. This includes developing implementation strategies.....**To add impetus to Local Agenda 21 the Commonwealth has recently commissioned the development of a new how-to-do it manual for Local Councils which is due for release mid year.** This manual will go about assisting Local Government and local communities to forge and build local partnerships for sustainability.....The manual will draw on and incorporate the wealth of experience in developing and implementing Local Agenda 21 which has taken place around Australia and throughout the world since the 1992 Earth Summit....The manual will provide a series of practical steps for those Councils who do wish to implement and become involved in and undertake a Local Agenda 21."*

Senator Ian Macdonald's concerns about Australia's slow adoption of AG21 go back to 22nd February 1994 [when he asked in Parliament](#):

"I understand that Australia has been criticised for lagging behind in its efforts to meet its goals under the agenda 21 program to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. Do you agree that Australia is lagging behind?"

In 1999, Senator Robert Hill and Senator Ian MacDonald officially launched the [Commonwealth government's Agenda 21 instruction manual](#) for local councils, as recorded by the [May 2000 edition](#) of [Local Government Focus](#):

"In November 1999, Senator Hill, Minister for the Environment and Heritage, launched Our Community Our Future: A Guide to Local Agenda 21, which is an important resource to assist Councils in implementing Local Agenda 21. The launch was held at a reception at Parliament House and coincided with the National General Assembly of the Australian Local Government Association. Over 60 elected members and senior managers attended the reception to launch Our Community Our Future, demonstrating the increasing interest in Local Agenda 21."

As is noted by Tamworth Council in the [Namoi Catchment Sustainability Plan](#), Agenda 21 is based upon the idea that Australians now cause climate or environmental crimes in other parts of the world:

“The Earth Summit created Agenda 21 - a ‘blueprint for a sustainable world’ and within that, Local Agenda 21, which sought to guide implementation of the blueprint at a local level. Local Agenda 21 advocated that people everywhere should ‘think globally, and act locally’, as every locality is part of, and has an impact on, the fortunes of the international community. The United Nations Earth Summit in Johannesburg, ten years later (2002), reaffirmed international commitment to change through grassroots action.”

2. **The Commonwealth and the States signed [the Intergovernmental Agreement on the Environment](#) in 1992. This agreement officially adopted the principles of sustainable development and AG21 throughout Australia and promoted local ESD legislation. Parties to the agreement were even required to recognise that the Australian Constitution is now out dated:**

“RECOGNISE that environmental concerns and impacts respect neither physical nor political boundaries and are increasingly taking on inter-jurisdictional, international and global significance in a way that was not contemplated by those who framed the Australian Constitution;”

Agenda 21 however, often described as a ‘soft law document’ or non-binding agreement, has primarily been enforced by embedding its various principles into our legal system rather than by adopting it *holus bolus* as an international treaty.

As a result, anthropocentrism, the traditional basis of NSW laws (160), has been overturned and replaced by a UN Agenda 21 ecocentric world view where the environment, and animals, reign supreme and man’s place in the world is secondary (161, 162, 163, 164, 165). This philosophy now forms the basis of new environmental laws and the flourishing NSW environmental legal system (166; see also Sally McGeoch, *The Challenge of Green Tape*, NSW Business Chamber). As has been noted by Pain (166; see also Sally McGeoch, *The Challenge of Green Tape*, NSW Business Chamber): *“environmental legislation has moved away from being ‘anthropocentric-and-development orientated’ towards legislation that is ‘more environment-centred’.”*

Supporters of this world view, who believe property rights should be transferred from humans to plants and the environment, are insidiously rewriting our laws to support their ecocentric world view. According to [Justice Preston, Chief Judge of the NSW Land & Environment Court](#), *“I have endeavoured to raise for consideration ways in which environmental law can beneficially embrace ecocentrism. These ways involve extending legal considerateness to all of the earth’s community of life, not just its human members.”*

Indeed, so entrenched has Agenda 21 become that it has even infiltrated the legal system of NSW to the extent the ecocentric principles of this imported undemocratic sustainability program are frequently used to pass judgement upon, and penalise, NSW citizens (166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 174, 175, 176, 177, 178, 179, 180; see also Sally McGeoch, *The Challenge of Green Tape*, NSW Business Chamber)

This new environment centred ecocentric philosophy or environmental ethics has led to an explosion in both the complexity and number of new environmental laws (Sally McGeoch, *The Challenge of Green Tape*, NSW Business Chamber) and these laws are increasingly being

undemocratically used by State and local government to override and erode property rights of NSW landholders ([180](#), [181](#), [182](#), [183](#), [184](#), [185](#), [186](#), [187](#), [188](#), [189](#), [190](#), [191](#)).

According to David Farrier and Paul Stein in the [Environmental Law Handbook: Planning and Land Use in NSW](#):

“The perspective presented by the law has been quite clearly human-centred, or anthropocentric. Instead of looking at the natural environment as having value in its own right, we have looked at it from the point of view of humans. Before a 1997 amendment to the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act, ‘environment’ was defined in it as including ‘all aspects of the surroundings of man whether affecting him as an individual or in his social groupings’ (s.4(1))..... Recently, there have been attempts to modify the anthropocentric focus of environmental law. There is a changing consciousness about the interconnectedness of all living species and systems, encapsulated in a concern for the conservation of biological diversity. This has given rise to a new definition of ‘environment’ in the Protection of the Environment Administration Act (see page 4),

In 1997 [Greens MP Ian Cohen outlined the basis of the legal force behind Agenda 21](#) at that time:

“Agenda 21, a program of action for sustainable development worldwide,..... Agenda 21 stands as a comprehensive blueprint for action to be taken globally from now into the twenty-first century by governments, United Nations organisations, development agencies, non-governmental organisations, and independent sector groups in every area where human activity impacts on the environment..... While the agreements lack the force of international law, the adoption of the texts carries with it a strong moral obligation to ensure their full implementation. Therefore, it can be argued that Australia, and hence New South Wales, is under a strong moral obligation to ensure their full implementation. In fact, some of the obligations set out in Agenda 21 and the Rio declaration have found their way into national law; namely, the Intergovernmental Agreement on the Environment, which is annexed to the National Environment Protection Council (New South Wales) Act 1995.....The National Environment Protection Council (New South Wales) Act 1995 annexes the Intergovernmental Agreement on the Environment. On 1 May 1992 an agreement was made between the Commonwealth, the States - including New South Wales - the Australian Capital Territory, the Northern Territory and the Australian Local Government Association; that is, the parties to the agreement. The agreement sets out the responsibilities of the parties in relation to the environment and they agreed to take steps to fulfill their responsibilities.”

The decline of anthropocentrism and the rise of AG21 ecocentrism is creating a future where basic human rights, including the right to private property, is being challenged on environmental grounds. Not only the rights of plants and ecosystems, but also the rights of future generations will be utilised to justify removal of the human rights of the present generation.

3. Agenda 21 has been introduced as an undeclared or covert policy rather than an open electoral policy.

In an alarming attack on democracy, [Australian politicians admit that Agenda 21 is an undeclared or covert policy](#) which is embedded into policy programs and therefore the public need not be given any choice during elections.

4. Agenda 21 is a UN designed and monitored program. Australia has been surrendering control to a foreign power for 20 years as the Australian Government has been required to

complete regular extensive AG21 compliance or implementation reports for the [United Nations Commission on Sustainable Development or CSD](#) ([192](#), [193](#), [194](#), [195](#), [196](#), [197](#), [198](#), [199](#), [200](#), [201](#), [202](#), [203](#), [204](#), [205](#), [206](#), [207](#), [208](#), [209](#), [210](#), [211](#), [212](#), [213](#)). While AG21 and reporting agreements are not mandatory until enforced by international law or backed by Australian legislation, the legislators have been busy rewriting the legal system as is made clear by Justice Brian Preston, the Chief Judge of the Land and Environment Court of NSW in his paper on the "[Judicial Implementation of the Principles of Ecologically Sustainable Development in Australia and Asia](#)". The fact that these reporting requirements have filtered through to local councils is confirmed by [Baw Baw Council](#) in Appendix 2 of their [Climate Change Strategy](#), which notes that their Local Agenda 21 initiatives are monitored by the [United Nations CSD](#).

The nature of CSD reporting is described in some detail by [Farhana Yamin](#).

5. **Agenda 21 is even being used by the education department to educate our children ([214](#), [215](#), [216](#), [217](#), [218](#), [219](#), [220](#), [221](#)).** According to former NSW Minister for Education, John Aquilina, in the NSW Government handbook "[Environmental education policy for schools](#)":

"The New South Wales Government is a world leader in supporting environmental education in schools, with particular attention being given to Agenda 21, a global policy outcome of the 1992 Earth Summit. Agenda 21 has been recognised by the New South Wales Government as the basis for an internationally agreed course of action towards sustainability. This has led to legislation in a number of areas, including the Protection of the Environment Amendment (Environmental Education) Act, 1998."

Inclusion of sustainability principles arising out of the 1992 [United Nations Conference on Environment and Development in Rio de Janeiro](#) (where AG21 was born) in Australian schools was further facilitated by the [Australian Sustainable Schools Initiative](#), the [National Environmental Education Statement for Australian Schools](#), and the [Commonwealth's National Action Plan Environmental Education for a Sustainable Future](#). Moreland Council demonstrates a typical 'hands on' approach ([219](#)):

"The external Local Agenda 21 Committee of Moreland Council in Victoria is looking at innovative participatory mechanisms such as street theatre, eco-art exhibitions, industry forums (breakfast clubs), school prize giving and school-based 'visioning' through poetry writing and arts projects"

6. **ICLEI and Agenda 21**

Implementation of Agenda 21 or [Local Agenda 21](#) (LA21) at the local council level is promoted by ICLEI, [the International Council for Local Environmental Initiatives](#), the name now being changed to [Local Governments for Sustainability](#). In fact, [Section 7.21 of Agenda 21](#), specifically recommends involvement with ICLEI, which is hardly surprising since ICLEI was responsible for preparing the local council section of AG21 as outlined in their [Preparing for Tomorrow 2010 – 2015 strategy](#):

"Two years prior to the 1992 Earth Summit in Rio de Janeiro, ICLEI prepared input to and introduced the "local authorities" chapter of Agenda 21 into the UN Rio Declaration, thus initiating the Local Agenda 21 Campaign – with more than 10,000 local governments engaged, the first and largest global campaign of cities and towns the world has seen. Only eight months after the adoption of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change at 1992 Earth Summit, ICLEI responded and launched the Cities for Climate

Protection Campaign – the first and largest global campaign of local governments combating greenhouse gas emissions. In 1996, ICLEI launched its Eco-Procurement Initiative – the first and largest international network for public sustainable procurement. ICLEI initiated Local Action for Biodiversity – the only global program on urban biodiversity management. ICLEI pioneered local best-practice case studies, developed tools such as ecoBudget© and piloted Triple Bottom Line for local authorities.

ICLEI has achieved results that the planet notices.

Over the last 20 years:

We have built a global sustainability network of 1,200 local governments of all sizes in 70 countries.

We have instigated a movement of about 10,000 local governments that have engaged their citizens in Local Agenda 21;”

According to Maurice Strong in the [Local Agenda 21 Planning Guide](#), “The task of mobilizing & technically supporting Local Agenda 21 planning in these communities has been led by the International Council for Local Environmental Initiatives (ICLEI) & national associations of local government.” [International campaigns of ICLEI include](#) the “**Cities for Climate Protection Campaign & the Local Agenda 21 Initiative.**” So ICLEI was the instigator and driving force behind the global LA21 campaign in local councils as confirmed by [Darryl Low Choy](#).

In their [2010 – 2015 Strategy](#), ICLEI explains that the tentacles of ICLEI in Local Councils “will continue connecting cities and local governments to the United Nations and other international bodies” and [ICLEI will](#) “serve as a global entry point for cities and local governments to engage with the United Nations and international and national policy processes” and will “pursue more radical solutions.” [ICLEI will](#) “Advocate direct access to climate finance and other funds by local governments and an inversion of climate finance mechanisms to enable the implementation of needs-driven local development.” [ICLEI will promote](#) “Management of global environmental goods” such as “Climate, Biodiversity, Water, Food.” In other words, ICLEI intends to convert them to controllable tradeable commodities. [ICLEI will](#) promote “Municipal planning and management” or, in other words, they will help councils control land use. [ICLEI will](#) promote Local Agenda 21, that is, ICLEI will continue to assist councils to undemocratically implement foreign UN monitored sustainability programs.

The United Nations has found from 20 years experience that implementation of their global agenda by local authorities has been their most effective strategy ([227, 228, 229](#)), especially given the impediments of national sovereignty. Not surprisingly, according to the [United Nations Sustainable Development in the 21st Century Summary for Policymakers](#), the future of their global agenda depends largely upon giving more power and recognition to local councils ([228](#)):

“Empowering lower levels with means to act on their own

Progress towards more sustainable outcomes does not need to wait for a hypothetical consensus on what the future of the world should be, or how global affairs should be managed. Actions at lower levels can and should be taken as soon as possible.....

Empower lower levels of governments to act as agents of change on their own and try new approaches to sustainability....

Local governments also have a critical role to play as agents of change, as their closeness to their constituents enable them to embark on bold experiments of different paths to

sustainability..... Providing appropriate mandates and resources to all levels of governments Ultimately, the success or failure of sustainable development will largely depend on decisions and actions that are taken at the local level. This was well recognized by Agenda 21."

But the UN went further in their [Review of Implementation of Agenda 21 and the Rio Principles \(Draft – Jan 2012\)](#), even suggesting that local governments should be empowered by state and federal governments to communicate directly with the United Nations ([227](#)):

"All governance levels from local through global need to be vertically interconnected for bottom-up energy to meet top-down support. In order to bridge the gaps between different levels of governance well as between agenda and action, local governments need to be given a more prominent role in global UN processes. The intergovernmental level should recognize that local authorities have similar legitimacy compared to national governments, and with many local authorities governing bigger populations than the 150 smallest UN member states, it would be reasonable if they could get voting rights in the UN. New institutional arrangements for sustainability should be based on a multi-level concept of governance and include elected representatives from local, sub-national, national, regional and ultimately global levels. In the other direction, it is imperative that decentralization policies are accompanied with all the needed political, legal and financial support that local authorities need for implementing their localized strategies for sustainability."

It is hardly surprising that our subservient obedient politicians have been seeking to rewrite the constitution with a referendum to give more power to councils ([236](#), [237](#), [238](#), [239](#), [240](#), [241](#), [242](#), [243](#), [244](#), [245](#), [246](#), [247](#), [248](#), [249](#), [250](#), [251](#)). Given the commitment of the ALGA to Agenda 21 it is also hardly surprising that then [ALGA](#) President Genia McCaffery, [wrote to all councils in February 2011](#) directing them to support the proposed referendum so that the Commonwealth Government would have the power to directly fund councils to enable them to promote their national agenda.

7. Agenda 21 based upon deception and changing the name to protect the guilty.

Due to the undemocratic regressive nature of Agenda 21, various experts and government officials seem to prefer to mislead the public by avoiding the term "Agenda 21" and using instead terms such as ([220](#), [221](#), [222](#), [223](#), [224](#), [225](#)) "sustainability", "smart growth", "growth management" or "local environmental plans". Deliberate deception of the public it seems, is fundamental to the success of the program ([225](#)). And the deceit about the full implications and origin of AG21 is endemic throughout Australia ([226](#)):

"Throughout Australia it seems that there has been widespread uncertainty about the meaning, scope and value of the term 'Local Agenda 21'.....Some councils have chosen, for a variety of reasons, not to call their initiatives 'LA21' "....."However, this is not to say that LA21 is not happening within Australia. On the contrary there is Local Agenda 21 activity in every state and territory and many councils are working on projects that have at their core the processes of LA21, although they may not necessarily be using that terminology."

To further disguise the true goals of Agenda 21 the name has been changed to **Sustainable Development 21 or SD21** ([227](#), [228](#), [229](#), [230](#), [231](#)), while some local authorities have changed the name of Local Agenda 21 to '**Local Climate Strategy**' ([228](#), [229](#), [230](#)). The United Nations **Sustainable Cities** program is yet another spin off of Agenda 21 and the UN Habitat agenda ([231](#), [232](#), [233](#), [234](#), [235](#)).

One of the difficulties of course, is that AG21 has been designed as an open ended,

undefinable, ‘blank cheque’ plan without any clear limits or goals. According to [Farhana Yamin](#):

“Agenda 21 does not provide rules to be applied to particular situations. Agenda 21 is more like a cookery book containing many recipes that together combine to make a healthy diet, but the individual recipes, ingredients, and processes can be infinitely varied—and to good effect. It will take time, but certain ‘cooking rules’ and common ingredients (perhaps in the form of sustainable development indicators) are bound to emerge, as is consensus that some recipes are completely unpalatable and others everyone’s favourite. The CSD reporting process will generate the common ingredients as well as provide menus of suitable recipes.”

Similarly, according to [Mary Kay Barton](#):

“As those who have studied the United Nations’ “Agenda 21” plan know, “Sustainability” is a key buzzword that is part-and-parcel of the UN’s Agenda 21 agenda. It’s also meaningless and malleable – allowing activists and planners to bend and shape it to serve their agendas.....Whether the “Sustainability Plans” are in New York State or Timbuktu, there is nothing at all that is “sustainable” about any of this.”

Similar concerns have been expressed by Tom Anderson in his article [“Agenda 21 threat to homes, property of our middle-class”](#):

“Essentially, Agenda 21 gives the government power to assess and deem an area, an item, or a type of production as unsustainable, thus putting it under increased government control. This is a multi-faceted and dangerous program that could apply to all means of production — including land, water and animals, among other factors. Not only is this a direct violation of our freedoms as Americans, but it is an international overreach into our personal lives. It is also the antithesis of what our forefathers fought for when they put their lives on the line to establish a free America.....According to the United Nations, one of the principles of Agenda 21 is “that eradicating poverty and reducing disparities in worldwide standards of living are ‘indispensable’ for sustainable development.” This is a direct call for redistribution of wealth — not only nationwide, but on an international scale.....Property rights are not protected, and this could jeopardize our farms, our energy production and even our homes.”

Sustainability is clearly a vague undefinable term, yet it forms the basis of many Agenda 21 driven laws and political policies. Sustainability is about a journey, a destination, located at some [undefined time in the future](#):

“Sustainable development as defined by the UN is not universally accepted and has undergone various interpretations..... A universally accepted definition of sustainability remains elusive because it needs to be factual and scientific, a clear statement of a specific ‘destination’.”

As is noted by ANPED in their [EU Sustainable Lifestyles Roadmap](#):

“The transitions to sustainable societies are like discovery journeys into the unknown, they are about exploration, learning, discovery and change. Since the destination (what is a sustainable society) is unclear and the road towards it highly uncertain, the only way forwards is to take small steps and regularly evaluate whether we are coming closer to or drifting away from our ideal situation.”

Similar doubts are expressed in the Australian government's brochure, [Education For Sustainability](#):

"There is no proven recipe for success. Sustainability is an ongoing learning-by-doing process that actively involves stakeholders in undertaking change."

Yet, in spite of these facts, the global forces driving [Agenda 21](#) and sustainability have convinced our politicians to base our legal framework, political policies, and economic policies, upon a concept which is undefinable and therefore unjust. The problem it seems, is not justice and equity, but rather how to (260) "dismantle" those groups which oppose the undefinable concept of sustainability. **Clearly, the fact that the final goals and costs of AG21 are unknown amplifies the injustices perpetrated upon the Australian community by all those who have played a part in implementing this insidious destructive program while continuing to refuse to accurately inform Australians.**

AG21 is absolutely unique in being such a wonderful planet saving plan the name of which must be disguised, certainly not publicised!

Australian Politicians Version of AG21 – Denial, Deception, Pretend it is not Happening, & Refuse to Give Australians a Democratic Choice

The above evidence confirms the following facts.

1. Agenda 21 is a foreign pervasive program which has been designed by, and monitored by, the United Nations. **Implementation of AG21 therefore involves surrendering control, sovereignty, and human rights, to the UN.**
2. Agenda 21 and associated imported sustainability programs are shown to have been implemented extensively and pervasively, and by both major political parties and by all 3 levels of Government in every state of Australia for nearly 20 years. AG21 has penetrated from Canberra to local communities everywhere. **It shapes our legal system, our economic system, our environmental system, our political system, and even the education of our children.**
3. All major political parties have shown a consistent determination to implement Agenda 21 as undeclared or covert policy. Over a 20 year period both major political parties have opted to continue implementing AG21 while omitting it from the electoral agenda. As a result, community ignorance about AG21 and its implications are widespread. **This refusal to inform Australians and enable them to make an informed electoral choice constitutes a deliberate attack on democracy and the freedom to choose. Implementation of Agenda 21 is based upon a failure to accurately and truthfully inform Australians. It is based upon deception and trashing of democracy.**
4. The preferred means of implementation of AG21 is to enshrine the various principles of the program into local legislation. **Although councils are at the front line when it comes to implementing many aspects of AG21, councils are coerced and controlled by state governments which in turn respond to pressure from international agreements signed by Canberra.**

5. Supporters of AG21 claim it is a potentially planet saving program but yet rather than promote the virtues of the program with a blaze of publicity the name of AG21 is frequently changed to conceal its origin.

Given these facts the refusal of our politicians to ‘educate’ the public and permit voters to make an informed democratic choice is alarming. Rather than acknowledge or sing the praises of this 20 year old bipartisan policy initiative, many politicians go to extraordinary lengths to avoid discussing it all, perhaps even pretending it is not being implemented or is some kind of crazy conspiracy theory. [A typical case in point is Greg Hunt](#), currently the [Shadow Minister for Climate Action, Environment and Heritage](#). [According to Greg in regard to AG21](#) (pers comm):

“There is nothing to ban. It is a 20 year old non-binding declaration... Councils should not misuse a 20 year old agreement..... anyone who misuses a more than 20 year old non-binding declaration to justify contemporary action should not be doing so..... In terms of Agenda 21, it is genuinely an out dated declaration from 21 years ago which has no impact on us and should not be misused by others to justify local council decisions. There is nothing to withdraw from though as it is a non-binding declaration not a treaty. It is like a council motion from 1992.....And no, I am not aware of the details of Agenda 21.....I can honestly tell you that I had never heard of it raised once during the entire period of the Howard Government in the party room or in ministerial discussions..... For the final time i had never heard of the issue, heard it raised by Ministers, MP's or constituents until 19 years after the thing was apparently signed..... Given that for the first 19 years the issue appears to have escaped both of our attention can I respectfully suggest that the discovery of a dead, irrelevant declaration 19 years after the fact may cause everyone to be calm.”

Greg claims that AG21 is a “20 year old non-binding declaration”, “an out dated declaration from 21 years ago which has no impact on us”, “a non-binding declaration not a treaty”, a “dead, irrelevant declaration”. But Greg is a politician and a lawyer. But he is a politician who has failed to inform the electorate about AG21, and he is a lawyer who contradicts legal experts and his political colleagues regarding implementation of this foreign program. And while Greg claims “we have no powers over local Governments”, fellow politician [Senator Ian Macdonald claimed](#): **“To add impetus to Local Agenda 21 the Commonwealth has recently commissioned the development of a new how-to-do it manual for Local Councils which is due for release mid year.”** And when Greg says AG21 is a “dead”, “out dated declaration from 21 years ago which has no impact on us”, he is contradicting politicians, councils, state governments, and legal experts over the past 20 years. So [why is it so important for Greg to contradict the facts?](#) Is it because he is ignorant of AG21 and has “never heard of the issue”? That is, he has never heard of the most massive bipartisan policy initiative in the history of Federation? Or is he seeking to deliberately mislead or deceive Australians?

Either way, Australia desperately needs more competent people in Parliament. Australia is currently being destroyed by a combination of political incompetence and divisive anti-Australian politicians dedicated to global interests. Such incompetence or deliberate deception has no place in public office. Any system constructed on foundations of incompetence or deception is the very antithesis of ‘sustainability’.

Given the simple fact that politicians at all levels have been busy implementing AG21 right around Australia for nearly 20 years, and they have been doing so without democratic or electoral approval, it would hardly be surprising if they now prefer to deliberately conceal the facts. There is clearly a considerable incentive to continue the deception, a fact which may go a long way towards explaining the hypersensitivity of many politicians regarding this issue. Even though I did not use the term ‘conspiracy’ in my correspondence, [Greg Hunt even went so far as to associate Agenda 21 with a “conspiracy”](#):

“Can I ask if you honestly think that John Howard was involved in some global Government Green left conspiracy?.....I respect your views and encourage you to find and approach any councils directly and to attend Council meetings to announce and denounce any actions which you believe are part of a global conspiracy.”

[As I have stated elsewhere however:](#)

“Interesting that Greg would ask such a question when he has just recently discovered his colleagues have apparently been concealing AG21 from him for nearly 20 years! There are many more important questions such as:

- *Why are politicians undemocratically forcing imported sustainability programs upon Australian citizens while at the same time attempting to shut the debate down by pretending it is not happening?*
- *Why is it so important to politicians that the people be prevented from having a democratic say regarding AG21?*
- *What is the Liberal Party’s AG21 policy for the upcoming election?*
- *Will they be banning imported sustainability programs such as AG21?*
- *Will they be giving residents a democratic choice or simply opting to continue implementing this program covertly and undemocratically?*
- *What actions will Greg take now that he knows the truth?*
- *How should politicians be penalised for the deceptive and undemocratic implementation of foreign sustainability programs such as AG21?”*

Greg’s continuing failure to inform the public regarding the above facts relating to AG21 raises serious concerns about his suitability for public office. But this reflects a much wider issue concerning the more general failure of our political ‘representatives’ to accurately inform all Australians about the full details of Agenda 21.

The general attitude of our political representatives to Agenda 21, far from seeking to sing the praises of the program, is characterised by extreme evasiveness, dismissiveness, denial, or even ridicule, of anyone even mentioning it. Of course, the goals or end result of this attitude is to shut down debate and prevent Australians from being able to make an informed democratic choice when it comes to Agenda 21. Australian politicians have made it perfectly clear that [Agenda 21 is an embedded or covert policy](#) which has been removed from the electoral Agenda to prevent the people from having any choice. For instance, according to [Queensland Greens Senator Larissa Waters:](#)

“Larissa had a quick through of your question and wanted to let you know that the concepts in Agenda 21 are imbued through all of the party’s policy platform, whether explicitly outlined or not.”

Similarly, although Agenda 21 has been embedded into Victorian government policies for 1-2 decades, [according to Minister for Local Government Jeanette Powell,](#) it is not part of official government policy:

“Please note that the Victorian government has not adopted the Agenda 21 policy platform as part of its policies, but continues to take actions in accordance with sound environmental policies for the benefit of Victorians.”

So although the [Victorian government is implementing AG21 at all levels,](#) it has been excluded from official or declared policy to prevent Victorians from being able to make a democratic choice. And

even though the Victorian government, and the Victorian Premier and Cabinet, have officially notified the Commonwealth government and the United Nations that they are implementing Agenda 21 ([194](#), [195](#), [196](#), [197](#), [198](#), [201](#)), still the political parties in Victoria refuse to openly declare it as policy so Victorians can make an informed choice. In further, but yet unanswered correspondence with the Victorian government, I asked the Minister (pers comm, 4/2/2013):

**Hon Jeanette Powell MLA,
Minister for Local Government. Ref: CMINO43907**

Dear Jeanette,

I thank you for your letter of 23rd January to which I refer.

For some reason you completely ignored my questions which I therefore repeat again.

- *According to the voluminous evidence below and enclosed, your government has clearly been implementing, and permitting to be implemented, the Agenda 21 program for nearly 20 years, yet you have never declared it as policy. Why? Why is it not included in your official policy?*
- *Since the Victorian government (of both parties) has been endorsing Agenda 21 or implementing it for nearly 20 years, will you be adding it to your official policies or do you prefer to continue to implement it without mentioning it in your policies? Why?*
- *If you have no intention of adding it to your official policies will you be proactively seeking to ban it as has been done in Alabama?*
- *Since you state **“the Victorian Coalition government has not adopted the Agenda 21 policy platform”**, are you saying you have now banned Agenda 21 from Victoria and you now utilise a local sustainability program with no UN connections?*
- *Will you be officially declaring it as policy at the next election or do you prefer to continue implementing it without declaring it as policy? Why? Please refer me to relevant documentation.*
- *And do you now reject the Commonwealth Governments Local Agenda 21 guide? And have you now prevented Victorian Councils from importing foreign UN sustainability programs such as Agenda 21? Could you please supply documentation?*
- *Will you be taking legal action against the Municipal Association and Victorian councils (below) for implementing Agenda 21 when you have not approved it? Or will you be deregistering them?*

*The Minister for Major Projects in the coalition government, Mark Birrell, announced back in 1991 ([1](#)): “In this address I wish to outline the aims and objectives of the Coalition Government’s agenda for our capital city. It is important for me first of all to put on record my thanks to the Institute for the work that it has done to assist us in progressing elements of the “Agenda 21” program.” You now claim however: **“the Victorian Coalition government has not adopted the Agenda 21 policy platform.”***

Please supply documentation, such as press releases, to confirm the date when the Coalition decided to reverse its support for Agenda 21. If you are unable to do this my above questions remain.

You further state in your letter: *“Local government environmental policies and initiatives are a matter for individual councils to determine in accordance with the priorities of their communities.”*

Are you seriously suggesting local councils are totally independent of state government and are not subject to, and directed by, the [Victorian Local Government Act](#)? According to your government (2, 3):

Local Government in Victoria is administered under the Local Government Act 1989, which provides a framework for the establishment and operation of councils.

The Act is the main legislative instrument for Victoria's 79 councils. It commences with a Preamble that restates the constitutional recognition of local government as a distinct and essential tier of government.

Part 1A of the Local Government Act contains the Local Government Charter, which describes the purpose, objectives and functions of council.

In addition to these matters, the Local Government Act also includes provisions for:

entitlements for residents and ratepayers to vote in council elections

the conduct of local council elections, nominations and vote counting

independent Electoral Representation Reviews by an electoral commission

council governance requirements, including codes of conduct and disclosure of conflicts of interest

council decision making, including records of meetings, confidentiality and limits on decisions during election periods

levying and payment of council rates and charges

preparation of Council Plans, budgets and annual reports

councils' powers to make and enforce local laws

*Since you and your government are clearly responsible for councils implementation of Agenda 21, why did you claim **"the Victorian Coalition government has not adopted the Agenda 21 policy platform?"** On the other hand, if councils are implementing this program illegally, as is implicit from your statement, without permission of the state government, what action will you be taking?*

Since Agenda 21 is a bipartisan policy of 20 years duration amongst all 3 levels of government, clearly it is the most massive policy initiative ever undertaken in the history of Australian federation. Given this fact it is incumbent upon you to fully inform the public of the purpose, costs, and end goals, of this policy. You have failed to do this. Yet, the public have only been informed by a **"tokenistic"** program if at all. Why? When will this be corrected?

These facts are extremely disturbing to Australian citizens. I look forward to a more meaningful response."

So in Victoria we have the situation where the Coalition Minister for Major Projects back in 1991, Mark Birrell, admits Agenda 21 is part of Coalition policy ([261](#)), whereas the current Coalition government denies this even though they continue to implement it. Additionally, the Victorian government, Premier and Cabinet, have continued to advise the Commonwealth government and the UN that they are continuing to implement Agenda 21 ([194](#), [195](#), [196](#), [197](#), [198](#), [201](#)).

Quite clearly, the Victorian government, over a 20 year period, has gone to extraordinary lengths to deny Victorians any democratic choice as they continue to implement Agenda 21. Why do they consider it so important to remove the ability of Victorians to make a democratic choice?

But of course, the same thing is happening all around Australia. No government, whether Commonwealth, State, or local council, has enabled the people to make an informed democratic choice.

Countering the Misinformation & Deception & Strengthening Democracy & Sovereignty

It is clearly time to move forwards and ignore the flat-earthers and AG21 deniers who seek to defend and perpetuate the removal of democratic choice when it comes to Agenda 21. While there is no doubt that many are completely ignorant of AG21, and others have a very limited or [tokenistic](#) understanding of the total agenda, there is also no doubt that many **politicians and those driven by personal or ideological agendas deliberately seek to deny or distort the facts or spread misinformation about AG21. Such people are not on the side of the people for they are clearly not on the side of democracy, honesty, and freedom of choice.** When it comes to Agenda 21 those with their own agendas, such as politicians, the mainstream media, and the elites, cannot be relied upon for truthful publicity or the dissemination of factual information.

The facts, as sourced from extensive government sources, are clear from the above. But how many politicians or members of the mainstream media have conveyed these facts to the public? And how many have attempted to dismiss and discourage any discussion of these simple facts. Remember the names.

One of the difficulties often encountered when attempting to disseminate factual information is the overwhelming need for many individuals to blindly and unquestioningly follow others, commonly known as ‘mob mentality’, ‘herd mentality’ or ‘groupthink’ ([252](#), [253](#), [254](#), [255](#), [256](#), [257](#), [258](#), [259](#)). Groupthink has been described thus ([257](#)):

“It is the mode of thinking that happens when the desire for harmony in a decision-making group overrides a realistic appraisal of alternatives. Group members try to minimize conflict and reach a consensus decision without critical evaluation of alternative ideas or viewpoints.”

Clearly, groupthink is a manifestation of consensus thinking and blind adherence to peer group pressure irrespective of the facts or consequences. Indeed, eight symptoms of groupthink have been established which highlight this abandonment of rational judgement ([259](#)):

1. *Illusion of invulnerability – Creates excessive optimism that encourages taking extreme risks.*
2. *Collective rationalization – Members discount warnings and do not reconsider their assumptions.*
3. *Belief in inherent morality – Members believe in the rightness of their cause and therefore ignore the ethical or moral consequences of their decisions.*
4. *Stereotyped views of out-groups – Negative views of “enemy” make effective responses to conflict seem unnecessary.*
5. *Direct pressure on dissenters – Members are under pressure not to express arguments against any of the group’s views.*
6. *Self-censorship – Doubts and deviations from the perceived group consensus are not expressed.*
7. *Illusion of unanimity – The majority view and judgments are assumed to be unanimous.*
8. *Self-appointed ‘mindguards’ – Members protect the group and the leader from information that is problematic or contradictory to the group’s cohesiveness, view, and/or decisions.*

The consensus nature of groupthink and the collective rigidity and irrationality of their attitudes may result in extreme measures to preserve the consensus, even to the point of attacking any who disagree and perceiving them to be enemies who must be silenced ([258](#)):

“Mob mentality is similar to groupthink and spiral of silence. Groupthink is a communication theory and term coined by social psychologist Irving Janis (1972). It occurs when a group makes faulty

decisions because group pressures lead to a deterioration of "mental efficiency, reality testing, and moral judgment" (p. 9). Groups affected by groupthink ignore alternatives and tend to take irrational actions that dehumanize other groups.....Its symptoms include the illusion of invulnerability. This illusion creates a belief in inherent morality and superiority and in the rightness of their cause. Members in a groupthink atmosphere ignore the ethical or moral consequences of their decisions; they hold a stereotyped views of out-groups, i.e. they hold a negative view of outsiders as the "enemy" make effective responses to conflict seem unnecessary. They put a direct pressure on dissenters and are put under pressure not to express arguments against any of the group's views. Members censor themselves, which is a major symptom of spiral of silence and those in the group, particularly the leader have created an illusion of unanimity. Each group has self-appointed gatekeepers, i.e., members who protect the group and the leader from information that is problematic or contradictory to the group's cohesiveness, view, and decisions.....Groups engaging in groupthink do not allow dissenting voices and are prone to fanatical and dangerous coercion methods.....A government practicing groupthink and the perpetuation of propaganda to control its citizens is demonstrated in communist countries such as [North Korea](#) (Cummings, 2009; Kim, Han, Shanahan, & Berdayes, 2004). The closed regime of Kim Jong Il censors and controls the state-run media and uses propaganda to suppress its citizens by not promoting free-thinking and questioning authority and an unwillingness to voice opposing opinions."

While many politicians, and no doubt those in the mainstream media, are clearly aware of the truth, many others blindly follow because they are victims of group think who have been misled or deceived by politicians. **Those politicians, and those in the mainstream media, who seek to deceive and destroy democratic freedom of choice, are conspicuous by their extraordinary silence regarding Agenda 21. But they are equally conspicuous by their silence about policies to strengthen democracy and national sovereignty. The lengths to which they will go to avoid even discussing these issues clearly exposes their stance when it comes to truth, democracy, and national sovereignty.**

Moving Forwards with Positive Policies Based upon Democratic Freedom of Choice

When it comes to protecting against the threat posed by Agenda 21 to individual freedom and human rights and the threat to Australia's national security and sovereignty, there are two clear options.

1. **Because of the immediacy of the threat AG21 poses to basic human rights and national security, immediate legislative action is required to ban all related foreign or imported sustainability programs. Covertly surrendering control to foreign agencies is totally unacceptable and represents a serious attack on Australia's national sovereignty and security. Urgent proactive measures are needed to prevent such an anti-Australian sell out. Indeed, such action has already commenced in America where various authorities are now moving to ban Agenda 21 because of its fundamentally undemocratic regressive nature & the threat it poses to basic human rights, especially property rights ([263](#), [264](#), [265](#), [266](#), [267](#), [268](#), [269](#), [270](#), [271](#), [272](#), [273](#), [274](#), [275](#), [276](#), [277](#), [278](#), [279](#), [280](#), [281](#), [282](#), [283](#), [285](#)).**
2. When it comes to Agenda 21 and Agenda 21 derived sustainability programs, as soon as possible, at the next Commonwealth, State, or local election, the people must be correctly and fully informed and given a genuine democratic choice. **There is no justification for continuing to implement AG21 while deliberately excluding it from the electoral agenda to**

prevent freedom of choice and subvert democracy.

The importance of adopting an effective ban on Agenda is highlighted by the American experience. When the local government of College Station in Texas recently withdrew from Agenda 21, Councilman Jess Fields commented ([282](#), [283](#)):

“I am truly excited to announce that the proposed 2013 College Station budget will not include funding for this organization (ICLEI-an Agenda 21 organisation).....It is an insidious, extreme institution that does not represent our citizens, and for our taxpayers to continue to fund it would be ridiculous.... This organization is a threat to our individual rights and our local government’s sovereignty in decision-making.....ICLEI’s Charter and its Strategic Plan both reinforce what could already be surmised by examining its founding and history.....This is an international organization with an extreme environmentalist bent, which desires to impose its vision of ‘sustainability’ on the citizens of member cities and connect to the United Nations in a way that furthers that goal.....We do not need international organizations leading the way for us in how we develop our planning and development tools and regulations. It is better for policies to reflect the actual needs of our community than some amorphous concept of greenness or sustainability, promoted by an overarching international body.”

Effective anti-Agenda 21 legislation must completely cut, and protect against, any subservience to a foreign agency and restore national autonomy and independence. Recently for instance, the following law was passed by the legislature in Alabama banning Agenda 21 ([284](#)):

Senate Bill 477

“Section 1. (b) The State of Alabama and all political subdivisions may not adopt or implement policy recommendations that deliberately or inadvertently infringe or restrict private property rights without due process, as may be required by policy recommendations originating in, or traceable to ‘Agenda 21’, adopted by the United Nations in 1992 at its Conference on Environment and Development or any other international law or ancillary plan of action that contravenes the Constitution of the United States or the Constitution of the State of Alabama.

(c) Since the United Nations has accredited and enlisted numerous non-governmental and inter-governmental organizations to assist in the implementation of its policies relative to Agenda 21 around the world, the State of Alabama and all political subdivisions may not enter into any agreement, expend any sum of money, or receive funds contracting services, or giving financial aid to or from those non-governmental and inter-governmental organizations as defined in Agenda 21.”

Similarly, in the state of Maine ([281](#)):

An Act To Ban the United Nations Agenda 21 in Maine

Be it enacted by the People of the State of Maine as follows:

Sec. 1. 1 MRSA c. 22 is enacted to read:

CHAPTER 22 PROTECTION OF PRIVATE PROPERTY RIGHTS

§ 831. United Nations Agenda 21; international laws

2. Prohibition on restricting private property rights. *The State or any political subdivision may not adopt or implement policies that intentionally or recklessly infringe on or restrict private property rights without due process as may be required by policy recommendations originating in or*

traceable to Agenda 21 or any international law or ancillary plan of action that contravenes the United States Constitution or the Constitution of Maine.

3. Prohibition on transactions with organizations assisting in implementation of Agenda 21 policies. *Notwithstanding any other law to the contrary, the State or any political subdivision may not enter into any agreement with, expend any sum of money for, receive funds or contract services from or give financial aid to any nongovernmental or intergovernmental organization accredited or enlisted by the United Nations to assist in the implementation of the United Nations policies related to Agenda 21.*

SUMMARY

This bill prohibits the State or any political subdivision of the State from adopting or implementing policies originating in the United Nations Agenda 21 or other international laws that restrict private property rights without due process. Because the United Nations has accredited and enlisted numerous nongovernmental and intergovernmental organizations to assist in the implementation of its policies related to Agenda 21 around the world, the bill prohibits the State or any political subdivision from entering into agreements or financial arrangements with those organizations.

So far, resolutions opposing AG21 have been passed by Wyoming, Montana, Minnesota, Washington, Oklahoma, Iowa, Texas, South Dakota, Wisconsin, and Arkansas ([285](#)).

Conclusion

The facts are perfectly clear, and those who endorse positive values of political honesty, democracy, personal freedom, and national independence and prosperity, are already moving forward with policies to reflect these values and ban opposing destructive policies.

There will always be those who seek to sacrifice positive values, and the welfare of the general community, so they can pursue their own particular short sighted self-interested ideological agenda. If however, they are so proud of the planet saving advantages of AG21, then the people must be told the full story so they can make an informed democratic choice.

Those who deliberately seek to trash traditional Australian values, remove private property rights, destroy Australian sovereignty, independence and prosperity, while at the same time deliberately preventing Australians from making an informed democratic choice, have no place in public office falsely masquerading as public servants.

Australia has the opportunity to be leading the world and showing the way forward when it comes to reforms to ensure democratic freedom and national independence. Instead, we are being dragged in exactly the opposite direction by self-serving, introspective, backward thinking politicians who continue to force the whole country to suffer as they desperately chase their bizarre anti-Australian ideological dreams.

Those who base their political survival upon deception and subversion of democracy, to conceal their abhorrent policies and abandonment of the people, must be exposed to the full light of truth and the full extent of the law.