

## Email to David Hughes, office of Prime Minister Abbott, 3<sup>rd</sup> September 2015.

Email also included 2 attachments: [Post 2015 flyer](#), and [AG21 in Australia](#).

Dear David,

Thank you for your time on the phone.

As per your request for further evidence, I detail in this email some of the matters we discussed during our conversation. I have attached relevant background information.

### Agenda 21 a 'conspiracy'?

Firstly, your first response to the UN Agenda 21 program was to describe it as a 'conspiracy'. You then added that the people who complain about AG21 regard it as a conspiracy, meaning of course that you apparently regard LNP colleagues [who passed the resolution opposing AG21](#) as being conspiracy theorists! The government looks absolutely ridiculous on this issue with the constant disagreements and contradictions by different members of the government, as the enclosed flyer gives a small sample of. If AG21 has the appearance of being a conspiracy, then it is an appearance which has been created by successive governments by:

- The government secrecy surrounding it,
- the constant government contradictions,
- the refusal to answer simple questions,
- the constant pretence that it is 'voluntary' even while the government passes legislation to enforce AG21 provisions, and
- the absolute determination of successive governments, over 2 decades, to refuse to give Australians any democratic say.

The solution to this problem is clearly in your hands. Will the government ensure this entire program is brought out into the open and the people are fully informed and given a democratic say at the next election? Or do you prefer to continue to deny the people any democratic choice?

[As I said previously](#): *"when those who have been involved in implementing Agenda 21 describe the program they have been implementing as a 'conspiracy', it is hardly surprising that they would be extremely reluctant to discuss either the conspirators or their handiwork!"* This article by the way, clearly documents the strategies successive governments have used to subvert democracy and enforce the dictates of the UN in Australia.

### Refusal of government to state annual, cumulative, and final costs of UN AG21/SDG agenda

During our phone conversation I repeatedly asked you to state the costs of the UN AG21/SDG sustainability agenda but you kept referring to the 'foreign aid budget' even though I repeatedly emphasised I was referring to total costs. [According to the President of the European Commission](#), the Commission allocated a total of around 8 billion Euros for sustainability initiatives arising out of Rio+20 in 2012-13. What is the equivalent Australian figure, and also the cumulative costs of AG21 related initiatives over the past 2 decades?

Going forwards of course, the public should be advised of the predicted annual and final costs of the UN's 2015-2030 SDG agenda to be signed this month. The UN has stated \$2-3 trillion will be required annually (see encl) with \$1 billion required to bolster statistical systems to enable more effective surveillance of countries and citizens. The Australian government, and the ABS, have expressed their eagerness to assist the UN in this process (see [Rio+20 Global Outcomes](#) , [Rio+20 Outcomes for Australia](#)). As you are also aware, sustainability initiatives are embedded through all areas of the bureaucracy, and in fact, climate change also comes under the umbrella of the UN's sustainability programs. Even the [Australian Defence force is obeying the dictates of the UN](#). Since you are aware of these facts I cannot understand your preoccupation with 'foreign aid' when I asked for total costs. Total costs means all costs of sustainability initiatives, whether within Australia or overseas.

**What are the total projected annual and final costs for the UN 2015-2030 sustainability agenda? We still have not been advised of the total costs of the past 23 years of AG21, but now you have an opportunity to be up front and let the people know the full expected costs of the 2015-2030 UN agenda.**

### **Refusal of government to state final goals of UN AG21/SDG agenda**

When I asked you to openly state the final goals of the UN AG21/SDG agenda you referred only to 'poverty'. On 25<sup>th</sup> – 27<sup>th</sup> of September Australia will attend the [UN SDG Summit](#) and sign the ["Transforming Our World" 2015-2030 UN document](#):

#### **DECLARATION**

*"We, the Heads of State and Government and High Representatives, meeting at the United Nations Headquarters in New York from 25-27 September 2015 as the Organization celebrates its seventieth anniversary, have decided today on new global Sustainable Development Goals....."*

*On behalf of the peoples we serve, we have adopted a historic decision on a comprehensive, far-reaching and people-centred set of universal and transformative Goals and targets.....As we embark on this great collective journey, we pledge that no one will be left behind.....This is an Agenda of unprecedented scope and significance. It is accepted by all countries and is applicable to all,"*

The scope of this "transformative" agenda is obviously incredibly broad and pervasive, however, in the context of outlining the intended final goals I will, at this point, just choose the following specific aspect of this UN program.

### **Monitoring and enforcement**

Bob Baldwin recently attended the [First Forum of Ministers & Environment Authorities of Asia Pacific](#), during which the UN continued their efforts to enforce their global 2015-2030 agenda by moves to expand the role of environmental law ([1](#), [2](#)). UNEP Executive Director Achim Steiner claimed *"that to deny environmental justice is to deny fundamental rights, for example, failure to limit carbon emissions may threaten the existence of countries such as Kiribati, due to sea-level rise as a result of global warming."* According to Chair, Arifin Zakaria, Chief Justice of Malaysia, *"UNEP should consider an institutional arrangement to collate environment-related judgments and other relevant legal materials from countries, and post these to an Asia Pacific Environmental Rule of Law website, thus contributing to implementation of the SDGs and benefiting judges and other legal stakeholders."* UNEP has even established a regional office for ["Advancing Environmental Rule of Law and MEAs Implementation"](#) in the Asia Pacific region.

[The UN is steadily moving forwards](#) with its codification of international laws with [various UN departments and commissions firmly dedicated to the cause](#), especially the [International Law Commission](#). [The UN particularly draws attention to the importance of the rule of law in regard to](#)

[their sustainability agenda](#). Most importantly, the [UN's 'voluntary' global sustainability agenda](#) must be enforceable [by global law](#). For instance, at the UN SDG Summit Australia will agree to the following vague open ended UN demands.

**TRANSFORMING OUR WORLD:**  
**THE 2030 AGENDA FOR SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT**

*Finalised text for adoption (1 August)*

*8. We envisage a world of universal respect for human rights and human dignity, the rule of law, justice, equality and non-discrimination.....*

*9. We envisage a world in which every country enjoys sustained, inclusive and sustainable economic growth and decent work for all.....One in which democracy, good governance and the rule of law as well as an enabling environment at national and international levels, are essential for sustainable development*

*10. The new Agenda is guided by the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations, including full respect for international law.....*

*18. We are announcing today 17 Sustainable Development Goals with 169 associated targets which are integrated and indivisible. Never before have world leaders pledged common action and endeavour across such a broad and universal policy agenda..... We will implement the Agenda for the full benefit of all, for today's generation and for future generations. In doing so, we reaffirm our commitment to international law and emphasize that the Agenda is to be implemented in a manner that is consistent with the rights and obligations of states under international law.*

*19. We reaffirm the importance of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, as well as other international instruments relating to human rights and international law.....*

***Goal 16. Promote peaceful and inclusive societies for sustainable development, provide access to justice for all and build effective, accountable and inclusive institutions at all levels***

*16.1 Significantly reduce all forms of violence and related death rates everywhere*

*16.2 End abuse, exploitation, trafficking and all forms of violence against and torture of children*

*16.3 Promote the rule of law at the national and international levels and ensure equal access to justice for all*

But this is only one aspect of the rule of law since first the UN needs to dramatically increase global monitoring to ensure compliance. Additionally, this global monitoring and global law are only effective if national sovereignty is weakened so as not to obstruct the UN. [As the United Nations points out](#), the success of their post-2015 agenda is at stake and countries must surrender sovereignty to the UN if the UN is to have the power to deal with global problems. As was emphasised by [UN Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon at RIO +20, the 20 year anniversary of Agenda 21](#):

*"We have a common responsibility to act in common cause, to set aside narrow national interests in the name of the global public good and the betterment of all."*

But to make the UN 's enforcement plans possible, a revolution in global data and monitoring is necessary.

**TRANSFORMING OUR WORLD:**  
**THE 2030 AGENDA FOR SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT**

*Finalised text for adoption (1 August)*

*Data, monitoring and accountability*

**17.18 By 2020, enhance capacity-building support to developing countries, including for least developed countries and small island developing States, to increase significantly the availability of high-quality, timely and reliable data disaggregated by income, gender, age, race, ethnicity, migratory status, disability, geographic location and other characteristics relevant in national contexts**

Data is so central to the UN global agenda that the [Sustainable Development Solutions Network](#) (UNSDSN) was established and the [UN Data Revolution Group](#) was developed specifically to invent new and more effective ways of monitoring everyone in the world, with the eager help of national governments of course. The UN needs massive and instant real time data if they are going to be able to determine if everyone is living sustainably, and not damaging the climate on the other side of the world. And remarkably, even some scientists support this UN political agenda!! The [UN Data Revolution Group](#) have released their first report entitled "[A World that Counts](#)", in which they outline the vital need for data.

**Given these UN goals that Australia will agree to this month, please state the intended end results or final goals. Exactly how much sovereignty must we surrender to the UN by 2030 to satisfy their plans? What, typically, will be the proposed limit of global UN powers? And exactly how much data and monitoring will be needed, what will be Australia's role, what safeguards will there be, and do you propose to give the people any democratic say?**

**With the results of the past 23 years abandonment of autonomy and democracy clear for all to see, now you attend UN discussions aimed at continuing to subvert democracy and lock Australia into the UN's global agenda for the next 15 years. But will you come clean, state the final goals and final costs and give Australians a democratic choice? Or is it still an open ended undemocratic blank cheque as has been the case for 23 years?**

### **Use of the provisions of AG21 to restrict private property rights in Australia**

During our phone conversation you asked me to provide evidence that the provisions of AG21 have resulted in restrictions upon private property rights in Australia. I can only feel humbled by, and accept the sincerity of, your seeming suggestion that I may know more about this topic than you, hence the need to enlighten you. While not pretending to understand why you would be unaware of the facts that follow, given your position, to think the reverse is true would involve personal implications that would render this whole discussion meaningless. So I accept your lack of awareness.

There is of course, extensive evidence of the ways in which the Commonwealth has legislated to enforce the provisions of AG21, the links above, and the attachments, offering an extensive introduction. Basically, when a sufficient number of countries sign an agreement it is then considered an 'international agreement' by the Commonwealth which is then permitted, by use of the external affairs powers under the Constitution, to enshrine the provisions of the UN agreement into Commonwealth laws ([12](#), [13](#), [14](#), [15](#), [16](#), [19](#), [20](#), [21](#), [22](#), [23](#), [24](#)) This of course, then has a flow on effect, to State laws, and ultimately, Councils. Some examples of legislation based upon or including the principles of AG21/ESD include ([25](#), [26](#)):

- *the Commonwealth Agricultural and Veterinary Chemicals Act 1994, the amended Commonwealth Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Act 1975, the Commonwealth National Environment Protection Council Act 1994 (and complementary legislation in other jurisdictions);*
- [Commonwealth Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999 \(EPBC Act\)](#)

- [Wetlands policy and the Ramsar Convention](#)
- *new or amended fisheries legislation and environment protection legislation in the States and Territories; and*
- *jurisdictions which have included ESD in legislation which is not principally focussed on the environment,*
  - *- in New South Wales for instance, this includes the Environmental Planning and Assessment Regulation 1994, the State Owned Corporations Amendment Act 1995 the Water Board (Corporatisation) Act 1994 and the Electricity Legislation Amendment Act 1995, and*
  - *- while in Queensland it includes the Land Act (commenced in July 1995), amendments to the Mineral Resources Act - proclaimed on 1 May 1995 and the Planning, Environment and Development Assessment (PEDA) Bill which is presently out for comment*

[Julia Patrick summarises the disastrous affects of the EPBC Act:](#)

*“The Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act (EPBC Act) brought in by the then Environment Minister, Robert Hill, in 1999, has become a pernicious piece of legislation that is slowly shackling Australia. Along with its enthusiastic handmaiden, the 2003 Native Vegetation Act, it has grossly expanded its dominion, giving the environment movement carte blanche to canter off, hugely funded, to the detriment of a productive Australia.....*

*The precautionary principle in the EPBC Act is called up shamelessly: if a project is considered likely to have a detrimental impact on the environment, those responsible are in big trouble. Land clearing deemed likely to have “significant impact” on the red-tailed black cockatoo cost the company involved \$242,500.*

*The Earth Summit brought the environmental heavies into our lives, their followers infiltrating the bureaucracies and government, including local government. Clever marketing captures the well-intentioned but gullible and those who scent the money trail.*

*Now, under the smokescreen of protecting the environment, the ever-increasing reach of the EPBC Act gives those who find the present Australia distasteful the opportunity and means to remake Australia as a socialist state. It is sabotage from within.”*

Chris McGrath in [“Synopsis of the Queensland Environmental Legal System”](#), has further noted the incorporation of AG21 provisions into state laws:

*“International considerations may also influence the Queensland environmental legal system through international debate and policy documents (sometimes called “soft law”) such as Agenda 21 and The Earth Charter forming the basis for government policy..... The Queensland Parliament has enacted over 30 pieces of legislation that directly regulate activities impacting on the environment..... The Sustainable Planning Act 2009 (Qld) (SPA) recently replaced the Integrated Planning Act 1997 (Qld) (IPA) as Queensland’s principal planning legislation..... SPA is a complex piece of legislation but a conceptual structure of it is shown in Figure 4. Its overarching purpose is “ecological sustainability”*

The incorporation of the provisions of Agenda 21 or ESD into Australian or State laws has been considered in detail by Justice Preston, Chief Justice of the Land and Environment Court of New South Wales, in the following three papers:

- [The Role of the Judiciary in Promoting Sustainable Development: The Experience of Asia and the Pacific](#) - A Paper Presented to the Kenya National Judicial Colloquium on Environmental Law Mombasa, Kenya, 10-13 January 2006

- [\*\*Ecologically Sustainable Development in the Courts in Australia and Asia\*\*](#) - A paper presented to a seminar on environmental law organised by Buddle Findlay, Lawyers Wellington, New Zealand, 28 August 2006
- [\*\*Judicial Implementation of the Principles of Ecologically Sustainable Development in Australia and Asia\*\*](#) - A paper presented to the Law Society of New South Wales Regional Presidents Meeting, Sydney, NSW, 21 July 2006.

Justice Preston details the history of sustainable development and [Agenda 21](#), which was agreed to at the [United Nations Conference on Environment and Development \(UNCED\)](#) in 1992, and their inclusion in Australian laws through two guiding documents developed by the Australian government, the [Intergovernmental Agreement on the Environment](#), and the [National Strategy for Ecologically Sustainable Development](#):

*“Agenda 21, a programme of action for sustainable development worldwide, was adopted unanimously at UNCED. Together with the **Rio Declaration**, and the **Statement of Forest Principles**, they fulfil the mandate given to UNCED by the United Nations General Assembly when, in 1989, it called for a global meeting ‘to devise integrated strategies that would halt and reverse the negative impact of human behaviours on the physical environment and promote environmentally sustainable economic development in all countries’.....*

*In partial fulfilment of its promise entered into upon signing the various instruments at **UNCED**, Australia finalised the **National Strategy for Ecologically Sustainable Development (National ESD Strategy)**. The **National ESD Strategy** was launched in December 1992 and has been adopted by*

*the Commonwealth and each of the States and Territories in Australia. The **National ESD Strategy** is a form of intergovernmental agreement which records the public policy commitment of each of the governments and their agencies to implement the measures agreed to in the Strategy. It includes as appendices a summary of the **Intergovernmental Agreement on the Environment**, the **Rio Declaration on Environment and Development** and a guide to **Agenda 21.52** In a sense, there has been an incorporation of these national and international instruments as policies of each of the governments of the Commonwealth, and the States and Territories.”*

The underlying philosophy driving Agenda 21 and the rewriting of our legal system is based upon [ecocentrism](#), or the [transferring of property rights from humans to plants, animals, or the environment](#). Justice Preston explains in a recent speech entitled [‘Internalising Ecocentrism in Environmental Law’](#):

*“Ecocentrism involves taking a nature-centred rather than a human-centred approach, where the earth is valued not as a commodity belonging to us but a community to which we belong. Development of an earth jurisprudence requires the internalisation of ecocentrism in environmental law..... An increasing recognition of the first law of ecology – that everything is connected to everything else - and that the Earth’s ecosystem is, in a sense, a spaceship, may necessitate more sweeping positive obligations on landowners..... The Australian National Strategy of Ecologically Sustainable Development defines the concept as “development that improves the total quality of life, both now and in the future, in a way that maintains the ecological processes on which life depends.” Statutes could enhance implementation of ESD by imposing positive obligations on landowners to achieve ESD, including by the conservation of biological diversity and ecological integrity.”*

According to Bosselmann and Taylor in their essay about the [Significance of the Earth Charter in International Law](#), it was The Earth Charter that “challenged the anthropocentric idea of justice”. The Earth Charter was initiated by [Maurice Strong](#) and [Mikhail Gorbachev](#), and was [adopted by the Australian government in 2005](#).

The above legal papers document numerous cases involving the use of Australian legislation to enforce the dictates of the UN Agenda 21 plan which you regard as a 'conspiracy'. The Commonwealth EPBC Act is central to AG21 enforcement, however this is also used to enforce compliance in the states and local council areas as noted by Millar.

[http://www.actpla.act.gov.au/\\_data/assets/pdf\\_file/0006/13893/Millar\\_paper.pdf](http://www.actpla.act.gov.au/_data/assets/pdf_file/0006/13893/Millar_paper.pdf)

*“Although the principles of sustainable development have filtered down from international treaties and principles, the implementation of the principles of sustainable development is generally carried out from the ground up with outcomes achieved at the local level. This reflects the principle of subsidiarity and a trend towards decentralisation, where decisions are best made at the lowest level of governance able to adequately deal with them. This approach contrasts with the greater role that the Commonwealth is having in environmental decision making around issues such as water and climate change.”*

Native vegetation Acts and the like, originating from the provisions of AG21, and enforced by states and local councils in response to the Commonwealths external affairs powers, [have been used to restrict private property rights](#). Justin Jefferson has also acknowledged the threat to private property posed by the NSW Native Vegetation Act (87). As has recently been pointed out by Lorraine Finlay (93), the government attack on private property rights, which is occurring on many fronts, is completely at odds with frequent public statements about human rights or individual rights. The fundamental importance of private property rights in regard to human freedom have also been noted by Finlay (93):

*“the protection of property rights has evolved to mean owners have the right to obtain benefits from their property, including the right to put it to productive use and to dispose of it through sale”<sup>8</sup>. Property rights therefore encompass “the right to own property, the right to dispose of property and the right to exclude others”<sup>9</sup>. Since that time leading philosophers and political thinkers have emphasized the link between private property rights and the protection of individual liberty. This was noted by 4 Henry Maine, who claimed that the history of individual property rights and history of civilization “cannot be disentangled”.....*

*There is a well established causal link between property rights and higher standards of living<sup>21</sup>, with the ownership of private property motivating individuals ‘to improve the productivity and value of assets in the realization that family and designated heirs may benefit from such endeavour’<sup>22</sup>. In short, “\*the evidence is irrefutable that the protection of property rights is the key to wealth accumulation and secure and stable societies’<sup>23</sup>.”*

But in spite of the fundamental importance of private property rights, the NSW government is busily involved in plotting against landholders and tying their properties up in so much green tape they become unusable and worthless (86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93). One case in point is the disgraceful case of Peter Spencer (93). As Finlay indicates, these problems have been noted by the Productivity Commission (93):

*“In the 2004 Inquiry Report into the Impacts of Native Vegetation and Biodiversity Regulations the Productivity Commission concluded that while the retention, management and rehabilitation of native vegetation and biodiversity were important objectives, “existing regulatory approaches are not as effective as they could be in promoting these objectives and impose significant costs”<sup>64</sup>. In particular, it was concluded that the effectiveness of the clearing restrictions had been compromised, that “perverse environmental outcomes” often resulted and that landholders “... are being prevented from developing their properties, switching to more profitable land use, and from introducing cost-*

*saving innovations. Arbitrary reclassification of regrowth vegetation as remnant and restrictions on clearing woodland thickening in some jurisdictions are reducing yields and areas that can be used for agricultural production”*

Fundamental to a free society is the right to private property, yet this fundamental freedom has been under intensive attack for more than 2 decades as all 3 tiers of government, acting under the instructions of the UN, combined to remove or sterilise property rights by imposing onerous land use restrictions ([94](#), [95](#), [96](#), [97](#), [98](#), [99](#), [100](#), [101](#)). Given the divisiveness and widespread community anger resulting from this long running government drive to effectively remove property rights of Aussie farmers, the recent tragic death of Environmental Officer Glen Turner, reportedly as a result of a long running dispute about the rights of a farmer to farm his own land and remove native vegetation ([102](#), [103](#), [104](#), [105](#), [106](#), [107](#), [108](#)), is of interest. [Moree Plains Shire Mayor Katrina Humphries](#) summed up the divisive political policies which continue to target landholders and infringe land use and property rights:

*“The frustration that people have been pushed to under the likes of the Water Act, coal seam gas, mining, native vegetation - something like this was going to happen.”*

[According to Minister for Agriculture Barnaby Joyce](#): *“You have this crazy situation where you don’t own the vegetation on your land, the state government does, and many people have had enough.”*

And [according to Ben Pike](#), *“a bitter fight over land clearing exploded in a volley of gunfire with a “respected” farmer accused of shooting dead an environmental officer on a property near Moree.”*

Astonishingly, with the undemocratic cooperation of successive Australian governments, State governments, and local Councils, unconstitutional policies to restrict private property rights by imposing impossible land use restrictions have been driven by foreign agencies such as the UN, Australian voters having been denied any democratic say by successive governments ([109](#), [110](#), [111](#)). As has been noted by Flint & Martinkovitis ([Give Us Back Our Country](#) 2014, p 63-4):

*“the sweeping disregard for property rights particularly affects the nation’s primary producers and those with tracts of non-urban land. Indeed, it seems especially aimed at them.....in a number of other ways, legislation has been introduced which renders private property less useful and less valuable than it otherwise would have been.....this is being done by politicians, many of whom are selected by the traditional powerbrokers, and who act in accordance with the agenda of the elites..”*

Property rights, especially in rural areas, are being sterilised by UN driven environmental restrictions on land use which can dramatically devalue the property. As bad as Australian domestic laws are, since UN agreements are commonly considered a stepping stone to binding international laws, this becomes the ultimate step in enforcement. It is very much an ongoing process, as has been noted by Yvette Jackson in [“Evolutionary Spiral in the Development of Environmental Ethics”](#):

*“The ‘blueprint’ for building environmental ethics during the decade was Agenda 21 which advocated ‘global consensus and political commitment’ to solve environmental problems through international co-operation (including governments of developing nations) and community participation.....As international enforcement became more effective, nation-states recognising their treaty obligations would be stringently monitored, enacted domestic legislation or ‘local Agenda 21s’ to reflect their global obligations. To further encourage compliance with international environmental agreements, effective veto power to bring them into force was vested in developing nations. To prevent the exercise of any such veto, the developing nation was provided with certain ecologically sound economic incentives.....A new environmental ethic has evolved, reflecting acknowledgement of our obligations and responsibilities as humans to other species, and our abandonment of previously anthropocentric conceptions of ethics. It espouses biocentric ethics, to satisfy inter-generational and*



*global distributive justice.....A significant contribution of this holistic environmental ethic is that it has shaped global environmental law and policy, prompting 'global governance' to become more transparent in its dealings and broader in its jurisdiction in that it has encouraged participation of different non-governmental parties and promoted the integration of environmental issues with social, economic, cultural and political interests."*

## **Conclusion**

The evidence shows quite clearly that the judiciary in this country have been sterilising property rights in response to Commonwealth and state legislation based upon the dictates of the UN and their Agenda 21/ESD agenda. This has been occurring for more than 20 years and now you want to sign up for another 15 years of undemocratic UN interference courtesy of the UN's post-2015 agenda.

The ball is now in your court. What proactive measures will you take to restore property rights, restore democracy, and prevent domestic interference from foreign agencies? Will you seek constitutional reforms to these ends? Or will you just opt for more of the same? More abandonment of democracy and national sovereignty and more abandonment of the Australian people?

You have an opportunity to lead the world. Will you take it? Or will you sacrifice the best interests of Australia and continue to blindly following the UN?

Regards

Graham Williamson