

# THE PATHWAY TO WORLD GOVERNMENT

## Volume 2 – Essential Steps to Overcome Democracy & Sovereignty

### **Now the Problem of Global Fragility and Global Financial Chaos has Been Successfully Created, What is the Best Way to Overcome the Restrictions of Democracy and Sovereignty to Enforce the Global Revolution?**

Clearly a global government is not possible while there are effective national borders and anti-global restrictions of national sovereignty still operate. National borders need to be broken down not just economically with free trade and abolition of protectionism, but also there needs to be increased blurring of physical boundaries and cultural barriers in order to pave the way for complete global control. Any suggestion that a country should protect its own industries, workers, farmers, and its national borders and cultural values, is anathema to globalists.

### **Not enough to Remove Trade Barriers, Military Barriers Must also be Removed, Countries Must be Disarmed**

In Australia for instance, after wasting billions of dollars on imaginary climate disasters in 100 years time and in support of those who illegally invade Australia, now we are told Australia must slash its defence budget ([1](#), [2](#), [3](#), [4](#), [5](#), [6](#), [7](#)). And as the government continues to support illegal invaders, imaginary climate disasters, and send our money overseas and to the UN, ordinary Australians will be made to suffer by increased costs, jobs lost overseas, and cutbacks in welfare ([8](#), [9](#), [10](#)). As long ago as 1992, the UN, through their Agenda 21 sustainability program ([11](#); [Section IV, Chapter 33 of Agenda 21](#)), advised that all developed countries are expected to contribute to the UN global agenda by various means, including reallocation of defence budgets. And in Durban last year, the UN also mentioned military budgets as a source of finance for their global agenda ([12](#), [13](#), [14](#), [15](#)).

But given the fact that such reforms are clearly threatening the livelihood, security, and life style of millions of ordinary people, how is it possible to continue to introduce such unpopular reforms?

### **Banning Democracy, All for the Good of the Stupid Majority of Course!**

Supporters of a one world government realise, because of the abhorrence of their goals to ordinary people, that their campaign must initially be conducted covertly and beyond the glare of truth and democratic or media exposure if it is to have any chance of success. At some critical point however, when the framework of global government has been created and the ability of individual nations to resist has been sufficiently undermined (economically, politically, and militarily), then it will be necessary to ignore democracy in order to forcibly install the final shackles of world government. Not surprisingly, globalists are reluctant to openly discuss this final part of the process when they will trash democracy and ride roughshod over the will of the people in order to enforce their totalitarian global dreams.

## **Calls to ‘Suspend Democracy’ and Create a ‘Constitutional Moment’ in Global Governance**

Seldom do globalists openly admit their contempt for democracy or their desire to trample upon the democratic rights of the people. Instead, when democracy becomes a frustration, why not simply ‘suspend’ it for a little while so that a ‘constitutional moment’ may ensue during which the fundamental structure of global political power can be completely reorganised?

The idea that we are doomed by democracy, or the *tyranny of the majority*, and therefore may need to suspend democracy, is not uncommon ([16](#), [17](#), [18](#), [19](#), [20](#), [21](#), [23](#), [24](#), [25](#), [26](#)). When it comes to climate change, Clive Hamilton agrees that people need to be ([22](#)) “*jolted out of their complacency by militancy, even if that means a period of rancour, turmoil and danger*” because “*only radical social and economic transformation will give us a chance of avoiding dramatic and irreversible changes to the global climate.*”

So to some, the terrible prospect of people having a democratic say is too terrible to consider and the only option is a total suspension of democracy. Apparently there is no solution to be found within the confines and safeguards of democracy, only outside of democracy.

But what happens after the democratic rights of the people have been trashed? Will the perpetrators then reinstall a democratic system to permanently protect the democratic rights of the people to ensure such an event could never happen again? Not surprisingly, this part of their plans never seems to be publicised. But we have seen the answers so many times before in the regimes of despotic tyrannical dictators.

## **Overcoming Constitutional Impediments to a Global Government**

We can see what a terrible frustration constitutional restrictions are to globalists and those seeking to enforce their will upon the majority. According to the **Pocket Guide to Sustainable Development Governance**, in the lead up to Rio +20 ([27](#)):

*“The current governance of the global commons through the prism of national sovereignty remains one of the most fundamental obstacles to progress. Whilst global public goods that lie within national boundaries continue to fall under the jurisdiction of the nation state, it is likely that decisions will be made on the basis of national interests rather than global concerns. Nation states continue to be often ideologically opposed to governance arrangements that involve ceding sovereign authority over natural resources to a supranational institution making decisions in the global interest, especially when there is little short-term incentive to do so. This explains the absence of effective compliance mechanisms and enforcement regimes for many global environmental agreements.”*

Clearly, the fact that there is no evidence of significant global warming ([28](#), [29](#), [30](#), [31](#), [32](#), [33](#)), let alone the causation and reversibility of such fictitious warming by man, is completely irrelevant to those whose true purpose is global political control. They will find other excuses for global control, such as nuclear proliferation, terrorism, water, food security, etc. But how can they overcome the restrictions of national sovereignty?

### **1. Gradually Erode National Sovereignty by the Use of International Treaties**

This is a very popular way of surreptitiously and undemocratically overcoming constitutional restrictions. An excellent example of this is the recently passed so called [Clean Energy Act](#), which, according to [Part 1 Section 3a](#), seeks to enforce the [Kyoto Protocol](#) and the [United Nations Climate Change Convention](#) within Australia. In this instance, as is often the case, the surrendering of control to the UN and white anting of Australia's constitution and sovereignty was done without the realisation of most Australians. Given the glare of publicity about the [CO2 tax legislation](#) combined with the disapproval of the Federal Opposition, it is astonishing that the media and all political parties managed to successfully divert attention away from this further attack on Australia's sovereignty and constitution which results from [Section 3a of the Act](#). But this insidious white anting of Australia's sovereignty, a deliberate undemocratic government approved invitation for foreign agencies such as the UN to control Australia piece by piece, is normally introduced discreetly, beyond the glare of media truth and electoral accountability. Most conspicuously, both major political parties are careful not to offer Australians any real choice when it comes to treaties and therefore they completely avoid such policies during election campaigns. As a result of this campaign of deception, few Australians would be aware of the extent to which Australian sovereignty has been gradually sold out to foreign agencies through [international treaties](#).

The ability of the Commonwealth to override states with international treaties using the external affairs powers in [Section 51 \(xxix\) of the Constitution](#) goes back to the Franklin Dam case in Tasmania in 1983 ([34](#), [35](#), [36](#), [37](#), [38](#)). This breakthrough decision has paved the way for the Commonwealth to virtually override the constitution and the states to enforce international treaties from unelected undemocratic foreign agencies such as the UN ([39](#), [40](#), [41](#), [42](#)). As has been noted by Opeskin ([42](#)):

*"More recently, the federal executive has ratified international conventions covering subject matters that have traditionally been regarded as the province of the states, such as human rights and the environment. Attempts by the Federal Parliament to implement treaties in these areas have frequently inflamed the states, which have regarded the creeping expansion of federal legislation as undermining the balance of power between central and state governments."*

Of course these changes are progressively diminishing Australia's sovereignty as the country is gradually surrendered to foreign agencies ([39](#), [40](#), [43](#), [44](#)). In fact, it seems the DLP is the only political party openly seeking to limit the ability of the Commonwealth to override the constitution by using the external affairs powers ([45](#), [46](#)). When both major parties support selling Australia out to unelected undemocratic foreign agencies then democracy is dead ([47](#)):

*"We all fall into one of two camps", declared Downer. "You are either a globaphobe or a globophile". This is the argument to extremes, the 'false alternative': tell opponents they can be one extreme or the other with no middle ground. They can have either an irrational fear of globalism, or an irrational love of it, but a balanced viewpoint which is neither is not an option. Needless to say, Downer is a self-diagnosed globaphiliac."*

Of course, like most globaphiliacs or demographobes, one of the main tools upon which they base their particular utopia, is deception and consequent subversion of democracy. Did Downer openly announce his views about globalism and globaphobes during the election campaign in order to give the voters an informed choice? Or did he seek to subvert democracy and the right of voters to make an informed choice by failing to publicise the full agenda?

We all know what happens when a government is based upon deceit and contempt for democracy.

## **2. By pass the Constitution by Implementing UN Policy through Grass Roots Community Groups**

In addition to direct but piecemeal attacks on the constitution and national sovereignty using international treaties, another approach which is very popular and has been found very effective, is the use of UN inspired and controlled grass roots community groups. Such groups can be used to implement and promote the UN global agenda and they are not bound by the constitutional and sovereignty restrictions which apply to national governments. In this way, constitutional and sovereignty restrictions may be completely sidestepped, giving these groups enormous potential in the fight to breakdown nationalism and concede control to one global authority.

There have been two major developments in the establishment of UN controlled grass roots community groups. The first of these resulted from the establishment of [Agenda 21](#) & [Local Agenda 21 \(LA21\)](#) ([48](#), [49](#)) back in 1992 ([50](#), [51](#), [52](#), [53](#), [54](#), [55](#), [56](#), [57](#), [58](#)). The second, was the establishment of the **United Nations Parliamentary Assembly (UNPA)** in 2010 ([59](#), [60](#)).

### **Agenda 21 & Local Agenda 21 (LA21)**

[LA21](#), the local government application of Agenda 21, has been widely adopted by Councils throughout Australia who therefore now act as agents of the UN actively implementing UN policy in Australia at the local community level even though Australians have never been given a democratic choice ([61](#), [62](#), [63](#), [64](#), [65](#), [66](#), [67](#), [68](#), [69](#), [70](#), [71](#), [72](#), [73](#), [74](#), [75](#), [76](#), [77](#), [78](#), [79](#), [80](#), [81](#), [82](#), [83](#)). The UN has readily acknowledged the extraordinary success of the LA21 campaign for implementing their globalist policies around the world ([84](#)):

*“Local Agenda 21 has been one of the most extensive follow-up programmes to UNCED and is widely cited as a success in linking global goals to local action.”*

According to the United Nations, Agenda 21 requires that local authorities, as part of their new global role, enter into partnerships with ([61](#)) *“relevant organs and organizations such as UNDP, the United Nations Centre for Human Settlements (Habitat) and UNEP, the World Bank, regional banks, the International Union of Local Authorities, the World Association of the Major Metropolises, Summit of Great Cities of the World, the United Towns Organization.”* This has given rise to *bottom up movements* where local government and local councils are given progressively more power as compared to national governments. Not surprisingly, LA21 initiatives, administered by the [‘International Council for Local Environmental Initiatives’](#) (ICLEI), comprise an increasing threat to national governments from revolutionary *bottom up* movements ([98](#)).

Given the effective use of Councils to implement UN policy, it is noteworthy that the current Labor government plans to conduct a referendum at the next election to constitutionally recognise and give more rights to local councils ([85](#), [86](#), [87](#), [88](#), [89](#), [90](#)). The commitment to hold a referendum was part of an agreement signed by Bob Brown and the Greens Party, and the ALP, in order to form government ([88](#), [90](#), [91](#), [92](#)).

Constitutional changes are proposed in 2 fundamental areas, firstly financial recognition, and secondly, democratic recognition of local governments ([85](#), [87](#), [88](#), [89](#)). Proposals to support

financial recognition seek to give the Commonwealth the power to fund local councils directly, thereby bypassing the States (85, 87, 88, 89). The concern here is that local councils will be used to implement Commonwealth policy (85, 87, 88, 89). Democratic recognition on the other hand, may remove or reduce the current power of State governments to supervise or dismiss local councils (85, 87, 88, 89). According to the final report of the **Expert Panel of the Constitutional Recognition of Local Government**, there is limited bipartisan support for these changes (88):

*“The Opposition leader, the Hon. Tony Abbott MP, and the Leader of the Nationals, the Hon. Warren Truss, have both publicly declared their in-principle support for constitutional recognition of local government. More specifically, the stated Coalition policy is to support financial recognition.”*

Submissions to the report of the Expert Panel expressed concerns about (88) “unintended consequences” such as possible High Court decisions preventing control of councils by state governments (93, 95, 96, 97). Concerns were also expressed about expanding centralism and an imbalance in Federal/State powers (92):

*“Inclusion of local government would change and impact on the responsibility and power of State Governments. Inclusion of local government in the Constitution would advance the principle of centralism to the disadvantage of federalism. More power would be transferred from the States to the Commonwealth. The mere mention of local government in the Constitution might be sufficient to enable the Commonwealth Government to undermine policies of State Governments by direct funding for local government to do its bidding.”*

Similarly, according to Twomey (94):

*“Despite many years of agitation, there still does not appear to be a cogent argument for why the recognition of local government in the Constitution is actually needed, other than to make local councillors feel important and appreciated. At best, the underlying argument appears to be that it might allow more money to be wheedled out of Commonwealth coffers on the basis that direct funding will give the Commonwealth more kudos and vote-buying for its buck. This is not a particularly noble reason for amending the Constitution and should be resisted.”*

In addition to local councils, under [Chapter 27 of Agenda 21](#), to further promote their objectives amongst community groups, the UN has enlisted the support of numerous non-government organisations (NGO). According to the UN review (84):

*“This affirmation of the important role of non-governmental actors has percolated all levels of government, international law and international governance. Specifically, the status and importance of NGOs – as outlined in Chapter 27 – has increased tremendously over the last decades. NGOs play roles as moral stakeholders, watchdogs, mediators, implementers, advocates, and experts.”*

The successful use of Councils, Local Governments, & NGO’s to implement UN global policy within Australia over the past 20 years is extraordinary given the fact that normal constitutional and democratic safeguards have been completely bypassed. This disturbing undemocratic use of local groups to usurp the protections of national sovereignty is a very disturbing development.

### **The United Nations Parliamentary Assembly (UNPA)**

The UNPA (59, 60), as [represented by Bob Brown](#), is intended to be a global citizen’s movement which will be independent of national governments and therefore will overcome the global

government impediments or limitations of national sovereignty ([99](#), [100](#), [101](#)). The ([100](#)) “UNPA has been proposed as a means to overcome the old paradigm of international affairs, in which only nation states and their governments are recognized as having international relevance.”

The global political changes promoted by the UNPA include ([101](#)):

*“- the idea of a direct person-planet relationship not mediated by national governments;  
-the idea of the individual as world citizen in addition to national citizen;  
-the idea of the world as one community, not just a collection of governments;  
-the idea of a world moving beyond the nation-state system toward a destiny of increasing political integration.”*

These global changes will progressively undermine national sovereignty and promote the formation of a world government ([101](#)):

*“The world needs a better method of making decisions and taking collective action in the common interest. We need, in fact, a system of world law, and we need a way to make those laws in a timely and democratic fashion. We need effective implementation of those laws, and a means for their enforcement. And, finally, the whole process has to be adequately funded.*

*What this amounts to is government.*

*To achieve it, two basic premises of the nation-state system will have to change. The first concerns the distribution of sovereignty. The second concerns citizen representation in international decision-making. Absolute state sovereignty remains the most fundamental premise of the present world order. Although it is under increasing pressure and has begun to admit exceptions, the general rule still is that a nation-state cannot be subjected to, or made accountable to, the decisions of any authority beyond itself. The direct consequence of this doctrine is that we cannot have lawmaking by majority decision within international institutions, including the UN. What we have instead is a slow, laborious process of treaty-making in which the resolutions of the UN General Assembly count for very little. The result is what we see: non-decision, leading to non-action, leading to deepening crisis.”*

Whether by subverting constitutional limitations by the use of international treaties, or by building bottom up politically active groups to oppose national governments, the long term effect upon democracy and sovereignty is the same. Also the same is the fact that the supporters of these strategies consistently seem to prefer a devious piecemeal strategy rather than exposing their full agenda to the light of democracy during an election campaign. These values of deceit, deviousness, and contempt for democracy, can be expected to provide the foundations for any ensuing global government.

### **A Constitutional Moment Needed for the Final Assault on Democracy**

While the abovementioned strategies can be expected to eventually render national governments impotent and irrelevant, the final stage, the complete restructuring of the global political and legal systems, may require a distraction caused by international chaos and turmoil. During this ‘*constitutional moment*’ the final chains of a global government may be shackled around the world and the world government constitution put firmly in place ([102](#), [103](#), [104](#)).

### **Scientists Call for Constitutional Moment and Global Government at Rio 2012**

Scientists are calling for a constitutional moment and changes in global governance to be considered at Rio +20 ([105](#), [106](#), [107](#), [108](#), [109](#), [110](#), [111](#)). This of course is justified by climate change even

though both climate change, and the ability of humans to control it, have yet to be scientifically confirmed. A *constitutional moment*, like a *suspension of democracy*, occurs when democracy is no longer convenient. While the *people are looking the other way*, radical constitutional changes are introduced to completely separate the future from the past. According to James Lovelock, humans are too stupid to prevent climate change and democracy needs to be suspended ([112](#)):

*"One of the main obstructions to meaningful action is 'modern democracy'. "Even the best democracies agree that when a major war approaches, democracy must be put on hold for the time being. I have a feeling that climate change may be an issue as severe as a war. It may be necessary to put democracy on hold for a while."*

But in spite of his earlier calls for a suspension of democracy, James Lovelock has now recanted and criticised the exaggerated claims of climate alarmists ([113](#), [114](#), [115](#)). If he had had his way however, and democracy had been suspended, it may well be too late now to reverse the damage done to our democracy and our freedoms. In spite of this obvious lesson, many are still dedicated to removing our democracy and preventing any freedom of choice.

Thank goodness James Lovelock woke up in time, but what about the others.....