

FROM CLIMATE CHANGE TO HUMAN RIGHTS

Asking the Wrong Question to Get the Right Answer

Issue 1 – Climate Change and Sustainability

Graham Williamson

January 2015

1. Climate change

Wrong question: Do you believe in global warming aka climate change?

Correct question: Do you believe Australia should give the UN & other foreign agencies the power to control Australian emissions and energy consumption, or should Australian 'solutions' be democratically determined by the Australian people?

We are constantly told that the global climate is getting hotter and hotter, and this is caused by man ([1](#), [2](#), [3](#), [4](#), [5](#), [6](#), [7](#)), the bottom line being, if it is caused by man it is controllable by man. Clearly there is no point constantly obsessing over an alleged increase of one half of one degree unless we can control it. This is where those kind folks at the United Nations come in, for they, out of the goodness of their hearts, have kindly offered to fix the world's climate if all the countries in the world do exactly as the UN requires. Most noteworthy is the fact, assuming humans could control climate, **that the possibility of any democratic national solutions to climate change have been completely removed from the public and political debate.** The assumption is, all the separate countries are helpless and useless, only the UN can provide the 'answer', though no evidence of this has ever been provided. According to those offering the 'solution' to climate change, the climate problem can only be 'fixed' if all countries in the world, even those producing virtually no emissions, adhere strictly to all the 'rules' provided by the UN.

So why have national 'solutions' been removed from the agenda? And why are those wonderful folks at the UN so caring that they have devoted countless hours and billions of dollars to helping countries like Australia 'fix' the climate?

Let us forget for the moment that saving the world is a very expensive business, and the UN will ultimately need to obtain all those funds from all the countries of the world. The reason why those pushing for urgent solutions to climate change have carefully removed any possibility of democratic national solutions from the public debate is simply because they consider political ideology is more important than saving the world. As Richard Glover explains in an article entitled, "[Bone-headed beliefs bound to end in death by drowning](#)":

"People on the left instinctively believe in communal action, the role of government and the efficacy of international agencies such as the UN. They were always going to believe in climate change; it's the sort of problem that can best be solved using the tools they most enjoy using. The right tended to be sceptical about climate change from the start and for exactly the same reasons. It's the sort of problem that requires global, communal action, with governments setting rules. It is a problem that requires tools they instinctively dislike using."

[As Glover points out](#), some on the left of politics seem to welcome any new environmental tragedy to reinforce their global belief system:

“There's a type of green zealot who appears to relish climate change. Every rise in sea levels is noted excitedly. Every cyclone is applauded and claimed as a noisy, deadly witness for their side. Suddenly, it's as if they have the planet's assistance in their lifelong campaign to bully everyone else into accepting their view of the perfect world. One without any human beings. Except for them. Living in a cave. Wearing an unwashed T-shirt that not only says "Support wildlife" but actually does.”

OK, so the political motivation is clear, how is it that the folks at the UN are so kind that they have devoted so much time and money to helping countries like Australia?

Strange though it may seem, far from the folks at the UN having a background in benevolent charity work, many have a reputation as ruthless tyrants and dictators seeking to forcefully impose their will upon others, so much so that the UN is often referred to as a “**dictators club**” ([8](#), [9](#), [10](#), [11](#), [12](#), [13](#)). Amazingly, even when it comes to torture ([14](#)),” *dictatorships that practice torture are more likely to accede to the UN Convention Against Torture (CAT) than dictatorships that do not practice torture.*” The UN it seems, is ruled not by benevolent charity workers but rather by dictators intent on controlling other countries ([10](#)):

“positive attitudes toward the United Nations are best encouraged by the suppression of information. University professors, like most liberals, are eager to portray the UN as a force for Good; and the best way to do that is by concealing a lot of embarrassing data....Critics of the UN point to its endemic corruption, its domination by totalitarian governments, and its lack of positive accomplishments.The UN was constituted, right from its inception, to subordinate the interests of any one nation to the will of the majority of nations.”

The end game then is control, complete control of the world. These folks are not the least bit interested in democratic national strategies. [According to Jasper](#):

*“The goal is as plain as day. In her new book, Environmental Overkill, former Washington Governor Dixy Lee Ray notes: **‘The objective, clearly enunciated by the leaders of UNCED [the Earth Summit], is to bring about change in the present system of nations. The future is to be world government, with central planning by the UN.... If force is needed, it will be provided by a UN green-helmeted police force’.**”*

So these are the folks who are telling us that they can control the climate for us as long as we accept that they make the rules, and we must all abide by those rules. But if the world is under threat from climate change, why has the UN completely ruled out any consideration of national solutions? And why is it that the UN has decided the rich countries have caused the problem and therefore owe compensation to the poor countries, which they claim, are the ones that suffer?

Don't believe it?

See how the globalists respond if there is a large swing towards democratic national ‘solutions’ to climate change! Their intolerance may be such that they may even call for the arrest of dissenters!

2. Ecologically Sustainable Development (ESD)

Wrong question: Do you believe in ESD & support ESD initiatives?

Correct question: Do you believe Australia should permit the UN to define & control ESD and the use of all energy & resources within Australia, or should these matters be democratically determined by the Australian people?

All sensible people want Australia to be sustainable. How could anyone disagree? But ESD is a UN concept embracing [Agenda 21](#), a global plan to be imposed upon every country in the world with the assistance of national and sub-national governments ([15](#), [16](#), [17](#), [18](#)). The UN driven sustainability agenda has been implemented nationwide by all three levels of government in Australia for more than 20 years ([15](#), [16](#), [17](#), [18](#)), yet in all this time, Australian voters have been denied any democratic vote. The UN even set up the Commission for Sustainable Development (CSD) to oversee the implementation of Agenda 21 around the world, and the Australian government cooperated, sending detailed expensive reports to the UN, even though continuing to give the people no democratic choice ([15](#), [16](#), [17](#), [18](#)). And [the leaders of the CSD](#), overseeing Australia's compliance with UN demands, included Uganda, Zimbabwe, Iran, Philippines, Colombia, Indonesia, Romania, and Kazakhstan ([19](#), [20](#)).

In fact, the many ways both major political parties in Australia have cooperated with the UN to impose their sustainability policies upon Australians against their will, and subvert democracy in this country ([15](#), [16](#), [17](#), [18](#)), represents one of the most disgraceful attacks on democracy since Federation..

Like climate change however, those pushing the global sustainability agenda have carefully kept any possibility of national solutions out of the debate entirely. In fact, the UN even instructed governments that sustainability initiatives must be embedded in the bureaucracy to ensure progress is not interrupted by a change of government ([15](#), [16](#), [17](#), [18](#)). And climate change is itself just one part of the sustainability agenda ([21](#)).

The Australian government of course, continues to undemocratically surrender to UN sustainability directives. While they complete their expensive compliance reports as directed by the UN, they tell the Australian people the agreements are “*non-binding*”. But if they are “non-binding”, why covertly complete expensive compliance reports for 2 decades and deny the public any democratic say?

Like climate change, any suggestion of a democratic national response to sustainability concerns can be expected to result in a hostile response from globalists. They talk of sustainability, but the UN and their globalist friends, are not the least bit interested in democratic sustainability. And they talk of tolerance, but they are extremely intolerant of any who disagree with their global ‘solutions’.