

HOW SUCCESSIVE GOVERNMENTS DESTROYED DEMOCRACY

Graham Williamson

March 2016

Successive Australian governments, rather than respond democratically to the people, have for more than 3 decades, sought to forcibly impose imported undemocratic policies upon the people. In other words, governments have responded to global forces and undemocratic foreign agencies, such as the United Nations, rather than the Australian people. Fundamentally undemocratic policies such as Agenda 21 and multiculturalism and Agenda 21 were imported and imposed upon the people while the people have been denied any democratic choice for an astonishing period of 2-3 decades.

The results of these policies are clearly seen by the changes that have occurred in Australia during this period. Australia has gone from a strong independent country to a weak dependent country which has been now forced to depend on foreign countries for basic needs that were once supplied locally by Australians. Social cohesion and mutual respect have declined so alarmingly in modern Australia that the people are now so unsafe that government says their only option was to increase surveillance and reduce the freedoms we have always taken for granted. And even our freedom of speech has been dramatically reduced as undemocratic reforms were thrust upon the people. And private property rights, a fundamental hallmark of freedom and democracy, have been progressively sterilised as successive governments, at the behest of the UN, rendered the land largely worthless by imposing onerous usage and development restrictions.

In order to demonstrate this shameful abandonment of democracy, this paper will examine one example pursued by successive governments. This is a United Nations program called Agenda 21, a program imported from the UN and undemocratically forced upon the Australian people by all three levels of government for more than 2 decades. **Agenda 21 is undoubtedly the most massive, enduring, and pervasive program ever imposed upon the Australian people.**

Both major political parties continue to deny Australians any democratic choice, and both major parties continue to conceal the costs of this pervasive program.

Agenda 21 & the 2030 SDG Agenda - A Summary of Key Tactics to Ensure Implementation & Enforcement (more details [here](#))

Agenda 21, and its renamed successor, the 2030 Agenda and the Sustainable Development Goals, are 'voluntary' programs which the UN insists must be enforced throughout the world. Voluntary that is (at least for the present) for governments. It is the task of governments though, to ensure the provisions of these agreements are certainly NOT voluntary for the people of the world.

How can this happen? Only by undemocratic government cooperation, as you can see below.

Firstly, [Chapter 8 of Agenda 21](#) required that the provisions of Agenda 21 be incorporated into the domestic laws of signatory countries through such mechanisms as a "*national strategy for sustainable development.*" [According to sections 8.16 -8.21 of Agenda 21:](#)

"The overall objective is to promote, in the light of country specific conditions, the integration of environment and development policies through appropriate legal and regulatory policies, instruments and enforcement mechanisms at the national, state, provincial and local level.....Each

country should develop integrated strategies to maximize compliance with its laws and regulations relating to sustainable development, with assistance from international organizations and other countries as appropriate. Each country should develop integrated strategies to maximize compliance with its laws and regulations relating to sustainable development, with assistance from international organizations and other countries as appropriate”

As always, Australia was quick to obey the UN with their [National Strategy for Ecologically Sustainable Development](#) and their [Intergovernmental Agreement on the Environment](#). This latter document even required signatories (PM + Premiers) to acknowledge that the Australian Constitution is no longer relevant in the era of UN globalisation:

“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”

As the United Nations demanded in 2001 in their report, [Guidance in Preparing a Sustainable Development Strategy, CSD](#), governments must enforce the provisions of UN sustainability agreements:

15. The national sustainable development strategy process is an adaptive process that would require putting in place mechanisms, policies, legal and institutional frameworks for coordinating and integrating economic, social and environmental aspects. Key measures that need to be taken in this context are: developing a sustainable development strategy culture; institutionalization of the strategy process; putting in place appropriate legal and enforcement mechanisms; and mobilizing, engaging and strengthening national capacity for continuous strategy development process..... A key element of successful national sustainable development strategies is the existence of a strong political commitment from the top leadership as well as from local authorities of a country..... Ensure the effective engagement and close involvement of the Ministry of Finance and Planning as well as the Council of Ministers in the strategy development process right from the beginning. In many countries, these organizations are responsible for the allocation of budgetary resources..... Engage local level institutions in the strategy conceptualization process right from the beginning. Institutions at the local level could be stronger driving forces for the national sustainable development strategy process than has been hitherto. A priority activity will be a review relevant legislation and policy with the view to removing bottlenecks and empowering local stakeholders in the development of the strategy..... The implementation of the strategy depends on the availability of financial resources. Indeed, finance is a major constraint to the achievement of sustainable development..... Good public communication is an important tool for implementing a strategy. It is a tool for ensuring broad ownership and participation..... As the national sustainable development strategy process is fundamentally managing relationships and often tradeoffs, putting in place appropriate legislation and mechanisms for their enforcement is indispensable for sustaining the strategy process..... Forums need to be set up for regular public consultation at the national, provincial and local levels. These forums as well as the media should be used to reach consensus”

Also in this report, the United Nations instructed countries (see p17, [Guidance in Preparing a Sustainable Development Strategy, CSD; 1](#)) that the [UN Agenda 21/sustainable development](#) agenda must be “continuous” & beyond party politics so a change of government will not stop the UN’s global agenda:

“A national strategy for sustainable development requires long-term and uninterrupted effort. Mechanisms, thus, need to be put in place that would enable the strategy development to be carried out as a continuous and cyclical process with broad national support, regardless of the political party in power..... the national sustainable development strategy process is a cyclical and continuous process of planning, actions, learning, planning and actions..... The sustainable development strategy process should be developed as a way of life..... Institutionalization of the national sustainable development strategy process. The national sustainable development strategy process needs to be fully institutionalized, and not be seen as ad hoc or one time undertaking.”

So according to the UN, their sustainability agreement must be fundamentally undemocratic, with steps taken by governments around the world to ensure the people have no opportunity to democratically reject the agreement. This is official, from the UN.

[As the Commonwealth government notes in their WSSD Assessment Report](https://web.archive.org/web/*/http://www.johannesburgsummit.org/html/prep_process/national_reports/australia_natl_assess0105.doc%20%28link%20is%20external%29), sustainability programs were largely implemented at a bureaucratic level, beyond democratic scrutiny, and the whole program was monitored by, and driven by, the UN Commission for Sustainable Development and the OECD:

https://web.archive.org/web/*/http://www.johannesburgsummit.org/html/prep_process/national_reports/australia_natl_assess0105.doc%20%28link%20is%20external%29

2.3 Experiments with institutional and process change

Important as the ESD process was, it was not the only government initiative aimed at incorporating a sustainable development culture in government and the wider community. There have been a number of parallel and subsequent attempts to develop institutions and processes for implementing sustainable development. The Resource Assessment Commission, established prior to the Rio Conference, was one early initiative which assisted government to institutionalise sustainability principles in decision making.....

Initially, implementation of the Intergovernmental Agreement on the Environment, the National Strategy for Ecologically Sustainable Development, and the National Greenhouse Response Strategy were overseen by an intergovernmental committee of officials reporting to the Council of Australian Governments. This arrangement operated between 1994 and 1997 at which time that responsibility was assumed by Ministerial Councils. The Ministerial Councils comprise Ministers responsible for similar portfolios in all Australian jurisdictions, for example the (then) Australian and New Zealand Environment and Conservation Council and the Agricultural and Resource Management Council of Australia and New Zealand.....In meeting our international reporting obligations (see below on reporting to the Commission for Sustainable Development, and to the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development).....

Australia's experience since Rio shows that it is very important to establish institutional and legislative arrangements which internalise the principles of sustainable development at all levels of decision-making.”

Peter Costello Wanted more Sustainability

In 1998 Peter Costello instructed the Productivity Commission to complete a [report into the Implementation of Ecologically Sustainable Development by Commonwealth Departments and Agencies](#) in order to “make recommendations designed to further implement the objectives and principles of the National Strategy for Ecologically Sustainable Development.” The Commission subsequently noted that although implementation was rather ad hoc, the principles of ESD were thoroughly embedded into the bureaucracy. [According to the report](#):

“The Commonwealth’s commitment to ESD implementation means all departments and agencies are expected to incorporate ESD principles in their decision making processes. At a minimum, all agencies

should abide by some general mechanisms to ensure decision making processes actually consider any economic, environmental and social impacts. Several agencies (for example, the Australian Fisheries Management Authority) are subject to specific legislation which requires them to explicitly address ESD principles.”

[As the Commission noted](#), ESD requirements had even been embedded into the Productivity Commission:

“Box 4.7 Productivity Commission and ESD

The Productivity Commission was established in 1998 through the amalgamation of three separate bodies — the Industry Commission, the Bureau of Industry Economics, and the Economic Planning Advisory Commission. The Productivity Commission Act requires the Commission to incorporate ESD objectives in its decision making. Specifically, part 2, s. 8 requires the Commission ‘... to ensure that industry develops in a way that is ecologically sustainable’. Other guidelines related to ESD include the need for the Commission:

- *to encourage the development and growth of Australian industries that use resources efficiently;*
- *while facilitating adjustment to structural changes in the economy, aim to minimise the social and economic hardships arising from those changes; and*
- *to consider Australia’s international obligations and commitments. Furthermore, the Act requires that at least one Commissioner has extensive skills and experience in applying the principles of ESD, and in environmental conservation.”*

Robert Hill wanted more Sustainability

At around the same time however, Environment Minister Robert Hill “*announced plans for perhaps the most far-reaching changes to Federal environmental laws in twenty years*”, [Shades of Green? Proposals to Change Commonwealth Environmental Laws](#). And amazingly, in spite of the proliferation of laws based upon ESD at that time, the [government claimed](#) current “*legislation does not include or make reference to the principles of ecologically sustainable development (ESD)*” and one of the government’s aims therefore was to [further embed the principles of ESD into Commonwealth laws](#):

“The package is likely to introduce a number of new provisions into the core of Commonwealth’s environmental law regime, such as the principles of ecologically sustainable development..... A significant feature of the proposed legislation is a requirement that decisions are to be based on the principles of ecologically sustainable development (ESD), including the precautionary principle (see below at p. 11) and the principle of ‘inter-generational equity’.”

As the Australian government admits in their [“Road to Rio+20” fact sheet](#):

“Australia has participated in sustainable development discussions for more than four decades. We have signed international treaties, supported regional initiatives and enacted international commitments through new laws and policies at home.....”

What the government did not explain however, was the various methods which were necessary to avoid democratic scrutiny of the policy, and completely avoid any accountability as far as costs were concerned (thoroughly embed throughout bureaucracy).

More recently, the UN again emphasised the importance of integrating or embedding their agreements.

http://www.un.org/en/development/desa/policy/cdp/cdp_publications/2014cdppolicynote.pdf

Global governance and global rules for development in the post-2015 era

<https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/index.php?page=view&type=400&nr=972&menu=35>

Embedding the Environment in Sustainable Development Goals

Over the last decades the international community has adopted an impressive number of environmentally related international agreements. According to one count there are more than 500 such treaties. (As an aside, 195 are concerned with water, 180 with chemicals and wastes, 155 with biodiversity, 60 with the atmosphere including climate change, and 45 with land use.)

As part of an initiative to identify a core set of environmental goals, UNEP examined progress in achieving 90 important goals from these treaties and found that only 4 of them showed significant progress. From this standpoint, there is much unfinished business on the international environmental agenda. So what have we learned from this and other reviews of goals and targets? The following factors, in particular, seemed to have played a key role in successfully meeting goals:

- *A key factor is embedding goals in effective governance regimes that ensure their implementation, accountability and compliance.*

Ultimately, the effectiveness of implementing environmental goals depends on how well they are integrated into institutional and governance frameworks at all levels (international, regional, national and sub-national). Effective governance includes adequate follow-up and compliance systems with independent monitoring and evaluation, and effective financing and economic incentives.

Foreign Minister Julie Bishop Continues the Deceit & Abandonment of Democracy

In 2012, when shadow Environment Minister Greg Hunt claimed he had never heard of Agenda 21, then Prime Minister Julia Gillard signed another UN agreement at Rio+20 to expand and continue Agenda 21 under the new name of the 2030 Agenda and the Sustainable Development Goals ([1](#), [2](#), [3](#)).

And now Julie Bishop wants to impose more of the UN brand of undemocratic 'sustainability' upon all Australians.

http://foreignminister.gov.au/speeches/Pages/2015/jb_sp_150929a.aspx?w=tb1CaGpkPX%2FIS0K%2Bg9ZKEg%3D%3D

"Australia is proud that, as an active participant at the San Francisco conference, we crafted a central element of the Charter – Article 56 – known as "the Australia Pledge".

Under this Article, United Nations members pledged to take action, individually and jointly, to and I quote "achieve higher standards of living, ... solutions to international economic, social, health and related problems..., and universal respect for and observance of human rights and fundamental freedoms."

Australia took that pledge on signing the Charter in 1945. Today I reiterate that pledge.

The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, endorsed unanimously last Friday on the floor of the General Assembly, is a manifestation of the Australia Pledge, and a testament to the fundamental role of this organisation. Only the United Nations could have produced this remarkable result"

But are deceit and abandonment of democracy sustainable?