

MEDIA MISINFORMATION & CENSORSHIP OF AGENDA 21

Incompetence or Bias: why the media has consistently failed to reveal the facts

Graham Williamson

September 2016

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This paper examines some of the reasons why the mainstream media have consistently refused to accurately publicise the facts pertaining to the UN's Agenda 21 program and its implementation within Australia. To this end, extensive evidence of false or misleading media reports about Agenda 21 are cited. A fundamental case in point, which is examined in some detail, are false media claims that the provisions of Agenda 21 are "non-binding". Evidence to the contrary from politicians and legal experts is examined in some detail, and an explanation for such false media reports is sought.

Cited evidence reveals 2 significant reasons for the failure of the media to report accurately.

1. The media has been complicit with the UN in acting as agents which have been paid, or trained, by the UN, for the purpose of promoting the UN's global sustainability agenda. In other words, the media is simply doing what it was paid or trained to do, namely rewrite UN news releases and recycle their promotional spiel.
2. The second reason found to possibly explain media determination not to publicise the facts about Agenda 21, is the political bias of journalists and media outlets. From the cited evidence it is clear that Agenda 21 is part of a globalist agenda, and it utilises some of the fundamental tools of socialism, namely, wealth redistribution, collectivism, social equity, and global regulatory controls over private property, energy, and resources. Cited evidence shows such tools are favoured by journalists who support left wing politics. While professional journalists should of course be capable of giving priority to the facts, and the public interest, as compared to their own personal political bias, the facts reveal that this frequently does not occur in reality. Political bias obviously pervades the media.

On the basis of the cited evidence the following conclusions are reached.

Never has there been such a massive, consistent, and long lasting, failure of the media in this country, a failure which continues to jeopardise Australian security, prosperity, national sovereignty, freedom, and democracy. The media failings are primarily twofold.

1. **The media have chosen to ignore, or misinform the public about, the most massive, pervasive and enduring policy initiative in Australian history, one that successive governments and Councils around Australia admit they have been implementing for more than 2 decades, while continuing to deny Australians any democratic choice.**
2. **Both major political parties have been shown to be acting counter to Australian interests by encouraging and enabling the UN to increasingly and undemocratically interfere in Australian domestic affairs. Media determination to ignore Agenda 21 means the media have consistently condoned, and refused to expose, the anti-democratic mechanisms governments have utilised in an attempt to implement this imported anti-Australian program. The media has enabled successive governments to completely avoid democratic accountability.**

Any attempt to prevent public debate regarding matters such as, undemocratic UN interference in Australia, and the move to ensure environmental laws cannot be democratically reversed, are simply inexcusable. This is much too great a price to pay for media subservience to the UN, political bias within the media, or media incompetence.

Introduction

[Agenda 21](#) is a United Nations [global 'sustainability' program](#), resulting from the Rio Conference in 1992, which is intended to enable the UN to 'save the planet' by defining and [controlling the 'sustainable' use of resources, energy, and private property](#) by countries and people around the world. As part of this process, the United Nations will also be empowered to bring about social equity by [redistributing wealth](#) and [transferring technology and resources](#) from successful Western nations to third world countries and dictatorships. Agenda 21 is the most massive, pervasive, and enduring policy initiative in the history of federation, [and has now been expanded and renamed as the 2030 SDG Agenda](#), signed on behalf of all Australians by Foreign Minister Julie Bishop. In fact, according to the UN, Agenda 21 and the 2030 Agenda are part of the [United Nation's plan for a new world order](#) where the domination and prosperity of Western nations is surrendered to third world countries. [Agenda 21 was introduced to Parliament](#) and initially implemented by the Keating government in Australia in 1992. The Howard government, and successive governments, [continued to coerce State governments](#) and [Councils](#) to undemocratically implement the dictates of this UN 'sustainability' agenda for the ensuing 2 decades.

Given the fact that the goals of Agenda 21 are anti-Western and [anti-democratic](#), [implementation has always been carried out covertly](#), especially at an executive or bureaucratic level, with the [people never having been offered any electoral choice](#). While the [ALP did include Agenda 21 as official policy for more than a decade](#), successive governments have generally preferred to implement Agenda 21 as [embedded unofficial or covert policy](#). Agenda 21, a deliberate attack on [Australia's sovereignty](#) and democracy, is an open ended initiative with [no final goal and no final cost](#). Little wonder [public authorities do not wish to discuss the imported UN program they have been covertly implementing for 24 years](#):

"try getting any information about Agenda 21, or 'sustainable development', from your local member or from your Shire Council and you will be confronted by a stone wall. Ask your Shire Council if it is a signatory to Agenda 21 or "Sustainable Development" and you will likely be treated like a leper."

So in the 2 decades of Agenda 21, what has the media been saying, have they been correctly and fully informing Australians?

The 'Voluntary', 'Non-binding' Agreement which may Send You to Gaol!

Media claims

The first point of confusion stems from whether the provisions of Agenda 21 are in fact enforceable. Almost universally in the media, if Agenda 21 is mentioned at all it is merely a 'voluntary' or 'non-binding' anti-poverty initiative ([1](#), [2](#), [3](#), [4](#)) which is of no concern whatsoever to any 'normal' person. [According to Jason Wilson](#), Agenda 21 *"is an entirely nonbinding and voluntary agreement..... it does not override national sovereignty and does not allow the UN to dictate what governments do. It has no legal force."* Similarly, [according to the Southern Policy Law centre](#), Agenda 21 *"has no force of law, no enforcement mechanisms, no penalties..... It is a feel-good guide that cannot force anyone, anywhere, to do anything at all....the media needs to stop reporting on Agenda 21 as if it were a bona fide controversy and plainly state the facts."*

Even former [Environment Minister Greg Hunt described Agenda 21 as being 'non-binding'](#). As a lawyer, he certainly should know.

Precisely why the UN would develop an unenforceable 'feel good' program costing, in 1992, [\\$625 billion annually](#), was however, not explained.

The truth – the part the media.....& Mr Hunt, forgot to tell you

It is necessary to distinguish between enforcing Agenda 21, firstly upon governments, and secondly upon the people. We shall consider the latter first.

1. Enforcing upon the people

[Various provisions of Agenda 21 are indeed enforceable upon the people](#), having been [enforced by domestic legislation by our elected representatives](#). Indeed, this was an explicit requirement of [Sections 8.7 -8.26 of Agenda 21](#).

[8.7. Governments, in cooperation, where appropriate, with international organizations, should adopt a national strategy for sustainable development based on, inter alia, the implementation of decisions taken at](#)

the Conference, particularly in respect of Agenda 21.,,,,,,,

8.12. Governments, in cooperation, where appropriate, with international organizations, should strengthen national institutional capability and capacity to integrate social, economic, developmental and environmental issues at all levels of development decision-making and implementation.....

8.13. Laws and regulations suited to country -specific conditions are among the most important instruments for transforming environment and development policies into action, not only through "command and control" methods, but also as a normative framework for economic planning and market instruments.....

8.14. While there is continuous need for law improvement in all countries, many developing countries have been affected by shortcomings of laws and regulations. To effectively integrate environment and development in the policies and practices of each country, it is essential to develop and implement integrated, enforceable and effective laws and regulations that are based upon sound social, ecological, economic and scientific principles. It is equally critical to develop workable programmes to review and enforce compliance with the laws, regulations and standards that are adopted.....

8.15. The enactment and enforcement of laws and regulations (at the regional, national, state/provincial or local/municipal level) are also essential for the implementation of most international agreements in the field of environment and development, as illustrated by the frequent treaty obligation to report on legislative measures..... In developing their national priorities, countries should take account of their international obligations.

8.16. 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....

8.17. Governments, with the support, where appropriate, of competent international organizations, should regularly assess the laws and regulations enacted and the related institutional/administrative machinery established at the national/state and local/municipal level in the field of environment and sustainable development, with a view to rendering them effective in practice.....

8.21. 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. The strategies could include:

a. Enforceable, effective laws, regulations and standards that are based on sound economic, social and environmental principles and appropriate risk assessment, incorporating sanctions designed to punish violations, obtain redress and deter future violations;

b. Mechanisms for promoting compliance;

c. Institutional capacity for collecting compliance data, regularly reviewing compliance, detecting violations, establishing enforcement priorities, undertaking effective enforcement, and conducting periodic evaluations of the effectiveness of compliance and enforcement programmes;

d. Mechanisms for appropriate involvement of individuals and groups in the development and enforcement of laws and regulations on environment and development.

e. National monitoring of legal follow-up to international instruments

8.26. A major part of the programme should be oriented towards improving the legal-institutional capacities of countries to cope with national problems of governance and effective law-making and law-applying in the field of environment and sustainable development. Regional centres of excellence could be designated and supported to build up specialized databases and training facilities for linguistic/cultural groups of legal systems.

The UN was quite emphatic, countries must adopt a [*national strategy for sustainable development*](#), and the provisions of Agenda 21 must be 'embedded' or 'integrated' into local laws, and these laws should be monitored by "*international organisations*" and "*other countries*". This indicates at the outset, a clear intent by the UN to utilise national and sub-national governments to enforce their dictates upon the people of Australia, and other countries.

And when Ros Kelly, then Environment Minister in the Keating government, introduced Agenda 21 to Australia in Parliament on the 26th May 1993 (see Hansard; p 951), she stated:

"The convention will enter into force and become legally binding on parties 90 days after it has been ratified by 50 countries. Australia ratified the convention in December 1992 and is one of 19 countries so far to have done so. Our expectation is that the convention will achieve the necessary 50 ratifications in 1994"

In response, Christine Gallus, Liberal Member for Hawker responded:

"In her speech today, the Minister for the Environment, Sport and Territories (Mrs Kelly) addressed the responses the Government has taken to give effect to these two conventions and to agenda 21.....The Minister is confident that the Government can meet the obligations that agenda 21 places on Australia through the arrangements established under the 1992 intergovernmental agreement on the environment..... The Minister mentions using the IGAE and ESD policy as mechanisms to implement agenda 21..... We give notice that we will be closely monitoring the Government's activities to ensure that the rhetoric is matched by action."

Successive Australian governments readily cooperated with the dictates of the UN by [adopting intergovernmental agreements, passing legislation, and by coercing State governments](#) and local Councils to implement Agenda 21 derived initiatives. As the [Australian government admits on their web site about CSD](#), "Australia's commitment to Agenda 21 is reflected in a strong national response to meet our obligations under this international agreement." And as the Australian government also 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"

[The judiciary](#) also readily admit [enforcing various provisions of Agenda 21](#), potentially resulting in legal action against ordinary Australians who defy the will of the UN. According to Chris McGrath in "[Does environmental law work?](#)":

"International considerations may also impact upon the Australian legal system through international debate and policy documents (sometimes called "soft-law") forming the basis for government policy. International policy documents and debate such as the Brundtland Report in 1987 and Agenda 21 in 1992 contributed significantly to the massive expansion of environmental law in Australia in the 1990s."

Initially the provisions of Agenda 21 were [enforced in Australia](#) by intergovernmental agreements such as the [Intergovernmental Agreement on the Environment \(IGAE\)](#) and the [National Strategy for Ecological Development \(NSES\)](#). The IGAE, which was signed by the Commonwealth, all State Premiers, and the President of the Australian Local Government Association, [enabled the Commonwealth to coerce, or 'persuade'](#) State governments and local Councils to implement various provisions of Agenda 21, an [undemocratic process](#) which began the [betrayal of the people](#). Subsequently, in 1999, the Howard government introduced the [EPBC Act](#) to [further strengthen the Commonwealth's power to enforce the provisions of Agenda 21 upon States and local Councils](#).

Principles of United Nations Agenda 21 and the Rio Agreement which were [embedded into Australian laws](#) included the [Precautionary Principle and the concept of Intergenerational and Intragenerational equity](#). [As noted by Stein](#), by 2003-2004, the Precautionary Principle was widely embedded in Australian legislation:

"Last November in Canberra a conference was held to mark the 10th anniversary of Leach. The symposium reviewed the startling progress of the precautionary principle over the last ten years. What emerged from an array of local and international speakers was ten years of judicial consideration and interpretation of the principle. The case of Leach began a process of recognition and acceptance of the principle as a part of Australian domestic law. This was in part because the Precautionary Principle received statutory recognition at all levels of government, federal, state, territory and local, in a wide variety of laws on the environment. This in turn led to judges in courts throughout Australia (and New Zealand) needing to come to grips with the meaning and status of the principle. Indeed, this is happening in jurisdictions all over the world....."

[Justice Kevin Bell again reviewed the use of the Precautionary Principle in 2010.](#)

Acting as agents of the United Nations, our politicians, and the judiciary, have ensured all Australians are forced to obey the imported undemocratic directives of the UN's Agenda 21 program by passing and implementing local legislation. However, as Justice Nicola Pain pointed out in "[Human rights and](#)

[environmental rights, A role for domestic courts? - an Australian perspective](#)", the High Court found, in the case of the *United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child*, that the Australian government had a duty to obey the dictates of the UN **even without enforcing domestic legislation**.

The facts are perfectly clear to see, so why have these facts been concealed or misrepresented by the media? Why do the media continue to deceitfully pretend Agenda 21 is entirely voluntary?

2. Enforcing upon national governments

It is certainly true that there was initially no obligation upon the Australian government to act upon Agenda 21. Like other international agreements, the Agenda 21 agreement was initially voluntary, but this was simply the beginning as far as governments which sought to undemocratically cooperate with the UN were concerned. It was the start of a process of so called 'soft law', where international monitoring and peer pressure is steadily applied in an attempt to define the essence of behaviour which constitutes responsible 'global citizenship'. It is this ongoing practice, utilising soft law initiatives to establish international norms of behaviour, which ultimately leads to binding global laws for governments (5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10). In fact, the [UNEP issued a training manual](#) to advise countries regarding the incorporation of Agenda 21/ESD into national and sub-national laws and in 1996 the Hague held an [International Environmental Conference on Codifying Rio Principles in National Legislation](#). Former judge at the NSW Land and Environment Court, Paul Stein, presented a paper at the conference entitled "*Turning Soft Law Into Hard: An Australian Experience with ESD Principles in Practice*." The Conference concluded (in part):

"1. The Rio Declaration should be given the fullest possible legal effect. It is necessary to incorporate the Rio principles into the national as well as the international legal system. There is a variety of ways to do so. An explicit way to reflect the principles as such in law is through codification of the principles themselves.

4. Rio principles should be incorporated so as to be given the highest possible status at each level (national, provincial, regional, local), in such a way that makes them, to the extent possible, justiciable, i.e. capable of judicial supervision. This will give guidance to policy makers, administrators, the judiciary, local communities and the citizens.

5. Developing case law in many countries including the Philippines, Australia, Pakistan and India shows that the judiciary (used in its widest sense to include all courts dealing with environmental cases) can play a vital role in the promotion, evolution and implementation of the Rio principles."

According to the "[Review of Implementation of Agenda 21 and the Rio Principles](#)" in 2012, the "legal instruments" section is one of the most successful parts of Agenda 21:

"Only five chapters were rated by both assessors as having achieved good progress or better: chapters 27 and 18 on involvement of NGOs and local authorities, chapter 35 on Science for sustainable development, chapter 38 on International institutional arrangements, and chapter 39 on International legal instruments and mechanisms).

Rio not only produced Agenda 21 and the Rio Declaration, it also produced international law instruments that dealt with specific sector issues.....As an event it is one of the most important examples of the delivery of international law, both hard and soft, that the UN has managed in its history."

As Yvette Jackson notes in "[Evolutionary Spiral in the Development of Environmental Ethics](#)", domestic environmental legislation often results from 'global obligations', such as the Agenda 21 agreement:

"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."

And [as Susan Downing points out](#), international law results from accepted norms of behaviour:

"If there is a practice that is so commonly followed by states and if, when following the practice, states demonstrate that they consider themselves bound by the practice, then it will become a rule of customary

international law. In other words, customary international law is the set of general principles that are so widely accepted and adhered to by the majority of states that they have become binding. Once a practice of states gains this widespread acceptance it will crystallise into a rule of international law or a 'customary international norm'."

[Laura Horn confirms](#) the automatic progression of soft law to hard law:

"As time passes, some soft law principles will progress to hard law. Gradually, evidence of state practice will accumulate and eventually [opinion juris](#) can be established to form the basis for customary international law to be created in relation to sustainable development."

As is noted by Ben Boer in "[The Globalisation of Environmental Law: The Role of the United Nations](#)", sustainable development policy is the result of the "*globalisation of environmental law*":

"The acceptance of the concept of sustainable development around the world is indicative of the globalisation of environmental law and policy..... This trend to globalisation in environmental matters is clearly being encouraged by United Nations' agencies, especially the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) and the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), as well as by other international organisations such as the IUCN - The World Conservation Union and the International Institute for Environment and Development.....Agenda 21 details a comprehensive framework for the cooperative generation of strategies for sustainable development and environmental management at a global level. Chapters 8,38 and 39 reveal an explicit recognition and promotion of the globalisation of environmental law and policy"

As Boer notes in the "[Globalisation of Environmental Law](#)", at that time this process had already resulted in 100 laws relating to ESD:

"the ongoing efforts of UN institutions have resulted in the development of international environmental instruments and programs, the drafting of environmental laws at a national level and training in environmental law..... Agenda 21 also explicitly recognises and promotes the globalisation of environmental law and policy..... It can be noted that in Australia there are now more than 100 statutes, at federal, state and territory level, which refer to ecologically sustainable development and the various principles associated with it. On any analysis, this trend is remarkable..... The latest manifestation of the influence of international environmental law in legislation is found in the [Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999](#) (Cth). The Act represents a serious attempt to come to grips with Australia's responsibilities under a number of environmental conventions, such as the Ramsar Convention on Wetlands and the World Heritage Convention. The Act also adopts the concept of ecologically sustainable development (ESD) and the precautionary principle."

[Boer cites Kellow](#) (A Kellow 'Natural Resources Decision Makers in the Australian Federation: Who, What, When and How Well?' (1996) 1 *The Australian Journal of Natural Resources Law and Policy* 1-9), who notes that Australian environmental laws are increasingly being imported:

*"In an era of increasing globalisation, environmental policy is becoming increasingly international. Global and regional multilateral agreements are increasingly requiring the adoption of national regulatory regimes, and are becoming increasingly specific about the obligations imposed. Increasingly, therefore, **environmental policy in the Australian federation is being made outside Australia and its development is being shaped by forces beyond the control of single governments, forces which are not always expressions of the noblest motives.**"*

Most recently, in "[The Environmental Rule of Law and the Sustainable Development Goals](#)", Boer draws attention to some '*new principles*' of environmental law, such as '*non-regression*', which means laws cannot be democratically reversed. [The IUCN](#), of which Commonwealth and State governments are members, agree that environmental laws should be irreversible. [Christine Tenorden, former Senior Judge of the Environment, Resources and Development Court in South Australia also agrees](#) that the "*repeal or diminution*" of ESD laws should not be possible.

In his speech on 'environmental justice' at the 1st World Environmental Law Congress in April 2016, [UNEP Executive Director Achim Steiner emphasised that the UN is working to enforce global environmental law](#):

"However, there are still some huge hurdles to implementation and compliance. In particular when it comes to the enforcement of legal rights and obligations, which is crucial for the attainment of environmental sustainability. UNEP is taking some clear actions to tackle this. For example, we are working with judges, prosecutors, auditors, government and non-governmental organizations on sharing knowledge that will help to develop, adjudicate and enforce environmental law."

IUCN judges subsequently established the [Global Judicial Institute for the Environment](#).

Even in spite of this history of transition from soft law to hard law, [Australian governments unfortunately, have a history of considering international agreements as merely being "recommendatory"](#).

The UN, in agreement with [Ronald Macdonald](#), already regards their stranglehold of international agreements as a [virtual 'world constitution'](#):

"Over the past 70 years, the United Nations has conducted a magnificent normative orchestra which has put on the world stage not only the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, but legally binding instruments including 10 core human rights treaties and countless declarations and resolutions such as the Declaration on the Establishment of a New International Economic Order, the Declaration on the Right to Development and the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples..... All States Members of the United Nations are bound by the Charter, which is akin to a world constitution."

It is clear that developments in global environmental law have a well-established history, and [are continuing to evolve](#). Paul Stein, a [former judge in the Supreme Court of NSW and the Land and Environment Court of NSW](#), and part of the [United Nations Environment Programme's \(UNEP\) Global Judges Symposium on Sustainable Development and the Role of Law, 2002](#), in co-operation with the World Conservation Union (IUCN), developed an online *Judicial Portal* to enable judges to share their experiences. [Stein confirmed that "much of sustainable development law is presently making the journey from soft law into hard law."](#) Paul Stein's contribution to ESD jurisprudence was such that [a tribute was organised to acknowledge him](#), with an address by Brian Preston (see [JURISPRUDENCE ON ECOLOGICALLY SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT: PAUL STEIN'S CONTRIBUTION](#))

Following on from the [Rio+20 World Congress on Justice, Governance & Law for Environmental Sustainability in 2012](#), and the resulting [Rio+20 Declaration on Law](#), in 2013 UNEP adopted [Decision 27/9](#) declaring that *"the violation of environmental law has the potential to undermine sustainable development."* The UN also established their [Environmental Rule of Law](#) web site. More recently, the [IUCN/UNEP 2016 World Environmental Law Congress](#) has [just concluded](#). Members of [IUCN include the Australian government and state governments](#).

As was aptly pointed out by Professor Nicholas Robinson ([cited by Stein](#)), the Chair of the IUCN Commission on Environmental Law:

*"In each jurisdiction where Environmental Law is strong and effective, we can see the role of the courts as an essential force. **The courts serve a crucial role in ensuring that the systems recommended in Agenda 21 may become widespread.**"*

The media have almost universally ignored the well-established global progression of soft law, pretending instead that soft law will remain unchanged and voluntary in perpetuity.

Once again, the facts are perfectly clear, and easily corroborated by legal experts, so why have these facts been concealed, misrepresented, or ignored, by the media?

Seeing Evidence of 'Conspiracies' Everywhere, While Ignoring Real Evidence

Media claims

Many journalists and media outlets, while expressing complete ignorance about the reality of legal enforceability, seem to prefer to write Agenda 21 off as some kind of 'conspiracy' ([11](#), [12](#), [13](#), [14](#), [15](#), [16](#), [17](#)). But the pejorative '[conspiracy theorist](#)' label is often applied simply to demonise and perhaps silence, anyone who dares to question the harmlessness of this UN program. [Is Agenda 21 really a 'conspiracy'?](#)

The truth – the part the media forgot to tell you

[A conspiracy is defined as](#) *"the activity of secretly planning with other people to do something bad or illegal."*

Agenda 21, having been published by the UN, [globally promoted by ICLEI](#), and implemented and promoted in Australia by a long list of Australian politicians, State politicians, and local Councils ([18](#), [19](#), [20](#), [21](#)) hardly fits the definition of being a 'secret' plan. Former Prime Minister Paul Keating for instance, In the [Foreword to Australia's report to the UNCSO in 1995](#), stated that Australia was proud to conform to UN AG21 requirements. Meanwhile, in NSW, [Education Minister John Aquilina](#) was also busy indoctrinating schoolchildren with the UN Agenda 21 plan, while Robert Hill, Environment Minister in the Howard government, issued an instruction manual or [Local Agenda 21 guide for councils](#). During Parliament, on 23rd September 2002, Christopher Pyne as [Liberal Member for Sturt, also sought credit for the Howard government's Agenda 21 achievements](#). [And in 2012 Julia Gillard renewed Australia's commitment to Agenda 21](#), and expanded this sustainability program under the new title of the post-2015 SDG agenda.

Is the media suggesting Former Prime Ministers Paul Keating, John Howard, and Julia Gillard, a whole list of successive State governments, and local Councils, are all co-conspirators?

Media claims that Agenda 21 is a conspiracy must be seen within the context of the media's silence on this entire issue, and as a result, the fact that many Australians are still not aware that the provisions of this UN program have been undemocratically enforced upon Australians for decades. If the media regards Agenda 21 as being a 'secret' plan, then the burden of guilt lies heavily upon their shoulders. Those in the media who label Agenda 21 critics as 'conspiracy theorists' typically display no history of having diligently sought to educate the public regarding the details of this UN program.

The media is still contradicting the facts with their endlessly recycled false sweeping claim that Agenda 21 is completely voluntary, has no impact upon [national sovereignty](#), and does not *"force anyone, anywhere, to do anything at all."*

Why Have the Media Consistently Censored or Misrepresented the Facts?

Agenda 21 is rather unique because of the facts, as admitted by the United Nations and a multitude of politicians, bureaucrats, and legal experts, and the media's consistent and enduring misrepresentation of these facts. Is this due to a deliberate bias, censorship, or endemic incompetence, or is there some other explanation?

Political Bias

[Political bias](#) in the Australian media has long been a fact of life and this is particularly evident where there is a global agenda such as climate change or sustainability. As [Richard Glover notes](#), the global "**communal**" enforcement action made possible by UN involvement in the climate change debate guarantees the enthusiastic support of those on the left of the political spectrum:

"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."

As [Glover notes](#), those who are blinded by the thick rose covered glasses of political fanaticism are guaranteed not to be able recognise reality.

The pertinence of Glover's analysis is underlined by the fact that the professional views of scientists themselves are also [heavily influenced by political bias](#). According to [Stenhouse and colleagues](#), the attitudes of meteorologists towards global warming are determined largely by their own personal political beliefs. While one would hope that

professional journalists would be capable of giving priority to truth and the public interest, in reality, the prevalence of [media bias](#) indicates this is not so.

While the commitment of the political left to global UN 'communal action' and transfer of power to the UN is well known, in recent decades the left/right polarisation on this issue has become considerably blurred because of the mutual bipartisan commitment to globalisation. **For this reason, both major political parties have been acting counter to Australian interests by encouraging and enabling the UN to increasingly interfere in Australian domestic affairs.**

Another global issue which commonly excites those in the media who are biased in favour of 'conspiracies' and global political agendas is the subject of a so called "[new world order](#)". [According to Jeff Sparrow](#), "*the call of a 'new world order' is a key phrase in the lexicon of paranoiacs.*" However, it would seem that Sparrow considers the UN to be comprised of a '*lexicon of paranoiacs*', since it has been the UN which has been openly calling for a new world order since their [1974 Declaration on the Establishment of a New International Economic Order](#). [In July 2016 the UN even announced](#) that their climate change agenda, and their 2030 SDG sustainability agenda (signed by Julie Bishop), [are both part of their ongoing plans for a new world order](#). The plan is to [reverse Western domination](#) by using climate change and sustainability to transfer funds, technology, and resources, from Western countries to impoverished or less successful countries.

But where was this reported in the media? Was it reported by Sparrow? Why?

Censorship and Cherry Picking

Many have asked the question: "[Why Does The Mainstream Media Have A Gag Order On Agenda 21?](#)" A typical example of this censorship occurred recently, as a result of the general [meeting of the NSW Liberal Party State Council in March 2016](#). Such was the concern by party members regarding the UN climate change agenda, and the UN Agenda 21 sustainability agenda, that the [following motions were put forward](#).

- 1. That the Federal Coalition Government be called upon to arrange and hold public debates/discussions between UNIPCC scientists and independent climate scientists on:
a) "The Global Warming/Climate Change Debate";
b) "The claims by the IPCC"; and
c) "Is all the science settled",
with the first one to be held in Sydney and the second in Melbourne, the others to take place, one in each State.*
- 2. The Liberal Party conduct an enquiry to determine by mid-2016:
a) Why all 3 levels of government in all Australian states, led by successive Australian Federal governments, implemented the supposedly voluntary United Nations Agenda 21 Program for more than 2 decades without it being specifically put to the people to assess and vote on in a democratic way;
b) What has been its economic cost;
c) Why successive Australian governments have led Australians to comply with undemocratic 'voluntary' UN agreements; and
d) Why have successive Australian governments been deceived by the UN IPCC/FCCC claims regarding Catastrophic Anthropogenic Global Warming/Climate Change, the main platform for the United Nations Agenda 21 Program*

The motions, which were apparently passed by an overwhelming majority of Party members, were ultimately [deferred by Party powerbrokers](#).

Not only did Party powerbrokers [seek to abandon democracy by burying these motions](#), but further, media coverage, especially given the sensational nature of these events, was sadly lacking ([18](#), [19](#), [20](#), [21](#), [22](#)). Most conspicuously, the taboo subject of Agenda 21 in the second motion was totally avoided by the media, [Sean Nicholls making a fleeting vague reference to](#) what he described as "*Australia's engagement with the United Nations*":

"A second motion called on the Turnbull government to hold an inquiry into Australia's engagement with the United Nations on climate change and report back to the party by mid-year. But an amendment by NSW MLC Catherine

Cusack, supported by left faction powerbroker Michael Photios, ensured the motion was sent off to the party's platform committee for consideration at a later stage."

Why this astonishing level of media censorship of Agenda 21? What are they so afraid of? The media are quick to ridicule and vilify anyone mentioning Agenda 21, but they consistently refuse to educate the public about this insidious undemocratic UN program.

What Price the Truth in the Era of Free Markets?

It seems there is virtual unanimity amongst politicians that the Agenda 21 anti-poverty program would most definitely NOT be a vote winner. **Likewise, it is generally agreed that the final goals and costs of Agenda 21 are unmentionable in decent democratic company.** No wonder all politicians have carefully removed this issue from the electoral agenda over an astonishing period of 24 years.

But what about the media? What about all those astute investigative journalists? Well, it seems many have their own agenda.

The United Nations has long been involved in training journalists, and the wider community, to promote their global agendas ([23](#), [24](#), [25](#), [26](#), [27](#), [28](#)). The UN has even produced an "[Advocacy Toolkit Influencing the Post-2015 Development Agenda](#)". [According to George Russell](#), the UN is organising a media blitz:

"The United Nations Foundation created by billionaire Ted Turner, along with a branch of media giant Thomson Reuters, is starting to train a squadron of journalists and subsidize media content in 33 countries.....It is taking place in parallel with an equally strong but unrelated media cheerleading push by supporters of strong climate change action.....the media-training-and-subsidy blitz could also be described as extraordinary bid to pump up public interest and editorial support for a vast and wobbly U.N. campaign to create a new social and environmental agenda that is too nebulous to criticize and too ponderous to implement with any coherent effect. Nonetheless, that agenda is intended to drive national social, economic and environmental agendas for the next 15 years.....So far as the new training and subsidy initiative is concerned, however, the problem is seen less in terms of problematic content and more in terms of popularizing the message by refocusing and re-educating the media—as well as helping to pay some of them for delivering the new intellectual freight.....Journalists from Australia to Peru, and from Britain to Zimbabwe will be given five-day training programs by instructors drawn largely from the ranks of former Reuters journalists. The material will include encompass among other things how to better understand and explain U.N. opaque concepts of sustainability"

But the UN is also [educating the next generation of journalists, our children](#), so both teachers and children may become agents for change ([29](#), [30](#)). [As UNESCO notes](#), teachers are "essential agents of change" in advancing the UNs sustainability agenda:

"The world today has more than 72 million teachers and countless numbers of non-formal educators. They are essential agents of change.....Teacher education institutions and teacher educators are key change agents in reorienting education to address sustainability."

UNESCO has also released a media training kit, "[Media as partners in education for sustainable development: A Training and Resource Kit](#):"

"UNESCO therefore invites all electronic and print media organisations, media professionals, training institutions and students to participate in the Decade of Education for Sustainable Development.....It also seeks to contribute to media awareness and understanding of sustainability, as outlined by the Agenda 21 Plan of Action for all nations endorsed at the 1992 Earth Summit in Rio de Janeiro. The media community is urged to use this tool to inquire, investigate and report further so that issues can be disclosed, discussed and debated publicly and democratically."

Debated "publicly and democratically" indeed! The media has an astonishing 24-year history of refusing to educate the public about the details of Agenda 21, even in spite of (or perhaps because of!) attending the UNs training school. And when someone dares to reveal the facts, [the media avoids rational debate and typically responds by demonising, ridiculing and personal attacks](#). Headlines such as; "[Agenda 21 is conspiracy theory. But don't dismiss Malcolm Roberts as a harmless kook](#)", "[Agenda 21: The U.N. Conspiracy That Just Won't Die](#)", "[Can One Nation's Malcolm Roberts convince voters of a peril few believe exists?](#)", and "[Agenda 21: a conspiracy theory puts sustainability in the crosshairs](#)", say more about the various authors rather than the facts of Agenda 21. **Such articles**

always prefer to ignore [Sections 8.3 -8.26 of Agenda 21](#) which states that Agenda 21 must be enforced by local authorities.

Perhaps the media only considers [Section 36 of Agenda 21](#) in which the UN stresses the importance of “promotion”:

“Education, raising of public awareness and training are linked to virtually all areas in Agenda/21.....Facilitating low-cost or no-cost use of mass media for the purposes of education..... Countries should strengthen existing advisory bodies or establish new ones for public environment and development information, and should coordinate activities with, among others, the United Nations, non-governmental organizations and important media..... Countries and the United Nations system should promote a cooperative relationship with the media, popular theatre groups, and entertainment and advertising industries..... UNICEF should make child-oriented material available to media as an educational tool, ensuring close cooperation between the out-of-school public information sector and the school curriculum..... integrating these efforts with the electronic media, whenever appropriate”

UN Propaganda Leads the Way, Media, Blindly Follow

We have seen above, that the media has consistently claimed, over an astonishing period of 24 years, that the Agenda 21 agreement implemented by successive Australian governments, is ‘voluntary’ or ‘non-binding’. The mainstream media has been virtually unanimous in refusing to inform the people about [Sections 8.3 -8.26 of the Agenda 21 agreement](#) which states that Agenda 21 must be legally enforced. And they have also consistently refused to inform the people about political actions taken by our elected representatives to honour these commitments and ensure the will of the UN is undemocratically enforced upon the Australian people. Why?

Rather than simply investigate the facts, it seems the media has simply been rewriting press releases and endlessly recycling UN propaganda.

UN Propaganda of course, for obvious reasons, also fails to mention Sections 8.3 -8.26 or any requirement to enforce Agenda 21. Instead, it pretends Agenda 21 is a voluntary feel good anti-poverty program. It is worth examining the following [UN Fact Sheet](#) in more detail. I have added highlighted comments after each of their ‘facts’.

Agenda 21: Just the Facts

Have you heard about Agenda 21 in the News? Not sure what to think? Here are some Myths and Facts:

Myth: *Agenda 21 seeks to promote “world government” through the creation of “a centralized planning agency that would be responsible for oversight into all areas of our lives.”*

Fact: *This is a completely spurious charge. Agenda 21 encourages, rather than compels, UN Member States to take into consideration the environmental impacts of their land, resources, and transportation development policies. Adopted at the 1992 United Nations Conference on Environment and Development (UNCED) in Rio de Janeiro, the document reflects a broad international consensus that worsening poverty and growing stresses on the environment require greater integration between environmental and development concerns. Such a comprehensive approach to development is necessary in order for countries to be able to continue to meet the basic needs of their citizens, improve living standards, and manage the planet’s natural resources in an efficient manner. Agenda 21 is not a treaty and is not legally binding. Rather, Agenda 21 sets out a general blueprint, or, in the words of Tariq Banuri, Director of the UN’s Division for Sustainable Development, “a common vision” for environmentally-sustainable growth. At the end of the day, implementation of any part of Agenda 21 is the prerogative of individual governments, not the UN itself. This is reflected in the document’s own preamble, which states that Agenda 21 “reflects a global consensus and political commitment at the highest level on development and environment cooperation. Its successful implementation is first and foremost the responsibility of Governments.” The voluntary and non-binding nature of this agreement has also been confirmed by the Heritage Foundation, a staunch critic of Agenda 21. Indeed, a recent paper by three Heritage scholars argues that it is local, state, and federal initiatives to promote sustainable development, rather than Agenda 21 and other international efforts that should be of greatest concern to opponents of sustainable development.*

RESPONSE

The United Nations strategy depends entirely upon a transfer of power (and funds) [from sovereign nations to the UN](#). As Chris McGrath points out in [“Does environmental law work?”](#), this importing of foreign ‘law’ creates ‘tensions’ which undermine national sovereignty:

“The fundamental basis or justification for international law rests on sovereignty and comity. Sovereignty is the independence of a state, that is, freedom from external interference in the conduct of a state’s affairs..... there is a constant tension between the sovereignty of individual nations and international obligations.....Fisher suggests that there have been four recognisable stages in the ongoing development of international environmental obligations to the present position where the obligations of states to protect the environment are becoming in practice more important than the rights of states to independence within their territory (that is, sovereignty)”

This progressive transfer of power and resources is intended to bring about [a new world order](#).

Myth: Agenda 21 would supersede the domestic laws of the United States and other sovereign nations.

Fact: As a non-binding agreement, Agenda 21 does not take supremacy over U.S. law. National governments are ultimately in charge of their own development, and neither the UN nor any other international organization has the right to encroach on the sovereignty of any country in the implementation of Agenda 21. This is once again confirmed by Tariq Banuri, who stated in an interview that “The basis of the international system is that all countries pursue whatever is in their national interest. A founding pillar of sustainable development is national sovereignty over natural resources.”

RESPONSE

It is true that the UN requires cooperation from nation states to commence global implementation of the agreement. However, the UN also built into the agreement a requirement that nations produce regular compliance reports and agree to be monitored by other countries. Ultimately this establishes global norms of behaviour which may result in global laws which do indeed override national laws. As the United Nations demanded in 2001 in their report, [Guidance in Preparing a Sustainable Development Strategy](#), governments must not only enforce the provisions of UN sustainability agreements, they must also ensure such agreements are fundamentally undemocratic by taking measures to ensure policies cannot be discontinued by a change of government. Further, in the [“Pocket Guide to Sustainable Development Governance”](#), an official precursor document for [Rio+20](#), it is claimed that *“national sovereignty is one of the most fundamental obstacles to progress”*:

“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,⁵ 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.”

More recently, the UN has emphasised in their report, [“Global governance and global rules for development in the post-2015 era”](#), that what is needed is *“responsible sovereignty”*:

“Responsible sovereignty: This principle should guide Governments to better exercise their policymaking sovereignty in an increasingly inter-dependent world. It implies the recognition that policy cooperation is the best way of achieving national interests in the global public domain.....Responsible sovereignty is necessary for the efficient delivery of the global public goods that are relevant for the management of interdependence and the achievement of global sustainable development.....Following the principle of responsible sovereignty, countries should also have the obligation to ensure that the policies of any one Government do not damage the capacities of other Governments to realize these rights.....However, national States have tended to commit themselves to those solutions that are in their narrow national interest or do not interfere with what they perceive as their national sovereignty, and/or those from which they are expecting to maximize their national interest at the expense of others, either by domination or by free-riding (Kaul, 2013). While global challenges continue to be viewed from this narrow perspective, the probability of failing to address them will remain high.....Responsible sovereignty is, no doubt, a necessary condition for States to cooperate in creating the conditions for the realization of internationally recognized rights and freedoms and to act according to the other key principles of global governance.”

Again the facts are clear, but these facts are ignored by the media, and are also absent from the UN’s ‘fact sheet’.

Myth: Agenda 21 is an amalgamation of socialism and extreme environmentalism with strong anti-American and

anti-capitalist overtones.

Fact: Agenda 21 provides a blueprint for sustainable development—development that simultaneously promotes economic growth, improved quality of life, and environmental protection. Agenda 21 was adopted unanimously by all 178 countries that participated in the 1992 Rio Conference. U.S. President George H.W. Bush was among the 108 world leaders present at the conference when the document was adopted.

RESPONSE

The collectivist, redistributionist, and totalitarian principles embedded in Agenda 21 are the hallmark of socialist/communist philosophies. This is a simple fact. The fact that the UN's sustainability agenda is simply part of their anti-Western new world order, is also no secret, [having been admitted by the UN](#).

Myth: The UN is bypassing national governments, using the International Council of Local Environmental Initiatives (ICLEI) “to make agreements directly with local governments” on implementing Agenda 21.

Fact: Many municipalities and cities around the world have found that Agenda 21 is a very good guide for their own urban planning efforts and have joined an international group—ICLEI—to help implement some of its recommendations. ICLEI is not part of the UN. Many cities and towns throughout the U.S. belong to ICLEI, but their participation is not linked to any UN mandate.

RESPONSE

The UN is establishing direct connections with local Councils irrespective of ICLEI.

Section 28 of agenda 21 specifies that local authorities should implement Agenda 21 and work with UN Habitat. In October 2016 Habitat have their 3rd conference. In the lead up to the Habitat 3 conference and the global urban agenda, [the UN has released](#) the [World Cities Report 2016](#) to further draw the strands of the global agenda together under the umbrella of the 2030 agenda. In this report the UN stresses that national governments must grant local councils more ‘**autonomy**’ by empowering them financially, and by legitimising them legally or constitutionally. If local authorities are not so empowered, and granted ‘**autonomy**’ then they will be unable to respond adequately to the global agendas set by the UN. The Un has established a [global urban law data base](#) to assist local authorities in standardising and globalising local laws in keeping with the UN agenda. The [UN also Released 22 Habitat III Issue Papers](#) to consider council funding, property rights, land tenure, and constitutional or legislative empowerment of councils.

On the 28th July 2016 the UN released the [Surabaya Draft of Habitat III Document](#), to be signed by governments in October

“We, the Heads of State and Government, Ministers and High Representatives, have gathered at the United Nations Conference on Housing and Sustainable Urban Development (Habitat III)..... to adopt a New Urban Agenda..... We commit to an urban paradigm shift for a New Urban Agenda that will:

(a)readdress the way we plan, finance, develop, govern, and manage cities and human settlements

iv. Supporting effective, innovative, and sustainable financing frameworks and instruments.....

B. EFFECTIVE IMPLEMENTATION

79. We recognize that the realization of the transformative commitments set out in the New Urban Agenda will require an enabling policy framework at the national, sub-national and local levels.....

We will take measures to establish legal and policy frameworks.....

We will support strengthening the capacity of sub-national and local governments to implement effective local and metropolitan multi-level governance.....

We will support appropriate policies and capacities that enable sub-national and local governments to register and expand their potential revenue base.....

We will promote sound and transparent systems of financial transfers from national government to sub-national and local governments.....

We will strengthen the data and statistical capacities at national, sub-national, and local levels to effectively monitor progress”

Once again, these facts are avoided by the media, and avoided in UN promotional propaganda.

***Myth:** Agenda 21 calls for the elimination of private property ownership, single-family homes, private car ownership and individual travel choices, as well as family farms.*

***Fact:** It says nothing of the sort. Agenda 21 does not call for the confiscation or appropriation of land or property anywhere, in any country. It is fully consistent with personal freedoms and the right of citizens to own property, homes, cars and farms.*

RESPONSE

Agenda 21 is very clear. It is based upon the concept of 'sustainability', that is, the UN's definition of sustainability. What is not sustainable is not acceptable to the UN. If land ownership or land use (or energy or resource usage), is not sustainable, then it is not acceptable. In practice this has caused [a 'sterilisation' of property rights as owners have no control over native vegetation on their own land.](#)

As noted by Cripps, Binning, and Young, in [Opportunity Denied](#), the UN Local Agenda 21 program has been driving this attack on property rights in local council areas around Australia:

"The merit of a stronger role for local governments in environmental management, including native vegetation management, is now well recognised, both at an international level through the development of Local Agenda 21 (ICLEI, 1996) and at a national level through numerous policy statements, including the Inter-Governmental Agreement on the Environment (Brown, 1994)."

Once again, these facts are avoided by both the media and the UN.

The type of UN Agenda 21 promotional propaganda depicted above is deceptive, and contradicts the facts contained either in the Agenda 21 document itself, or in other UN literature. It makes no attempt whatsoever to explain the measures the UN has taken to ensure various provisions of Agenda 21 are enforced around the world. It totally avoids or conceals this issue. The same is true in regard to other issues, such as effects on private property, democracy, national sovereignty, and the UN's global urban agenda.

While it is hardly surprising that the UN would conceal the disadvantages and the potentially unpopular anti-democratic features of Agenda 21 in their promotional propaganda, what is surprising is that most of the media have also adopted this same line, apparently accepted the UN spiel, and simply rewrote press releases. This is absolutely astonishing, especially since it has been continuing for 24 years.

If the media has been seeking to promote the UN's Agenda 21 agreement, and keep the people uninformed or misinformed, then they have been doing their job exceedingly well!

Conclusion

After 24 years there is still an astonishing degree of community ignorance about what is claimed to be a wonderful planet saving, anti-poverty program which has been implemented right around Australia. This is in spite of the emphasis [Section 36 of Agenda 21](#) put on "[education](#)" and "[community](#)" participation. [Even NGOs had their instructions for promoting Agenda 21.](#) Yet, in spite of all this, in spite of the [embedding of educational materials into school curricula](#), and in spite of the 24 year history of [extraordinary undemocratic mechanisms](#) politicians have utilised to implement and enforce various provisions of Agenda 21 on behalf of the United Nations, an alarming level of community ignorance continues. The media, which has traditionally informed the community and safeguarded against such ignorance when it comes to important issues, has totally failed in its duty. And failed for an astonishing period of 24 years.

Since Agenda 21 has been supported by successive governments for decades, and by Councils around Australia, it is a fact, not a so called 'conspiracy'. Although some may suggest mass media silence on such a major and enduring initiative can only be explained by a conspiracy within the media, other explanations are possible. The evidence reveals there are various reasons why the media has censored information about Agenda 21, or misrepresented the facts.

Firstly, the fact that Agenda 21 involves imposing controls on people regarding ‘sustainability, which of course includes energy use, land use, motor vehicle use, and general consumption, creates a clear awareness that such a policy would be political suicide in any free democratic country. This has always meant that the true goals must be sanitised or concealed by the use of more warm fuzzy [descriptive labels such](#) as “sustainability” or “sustainable development”, “smart growth”, “growth management”, “local environmental plans” or **Local Climate Strategy**. Agenda 21 is popularly considered a ‘planet saving’ or ‘anti-poverty’ program by those seeking to promote it. Given these facts, the most effective Agenda 21 promotional strategy may simply involve concealing the true details, or putting a ‘spin’ on the real consequences of this pervasive UN program.

In September 1999 the [Institute for Sustainable Futures](#) issued the final report of their project, [Policy Integration, Ecologically Sustainable Development \(ESD\) and Local Agenda 21 – Councils in NSW](#). In this report, which was prepared for the NSW Department of Local Government, Stella Whittaker and colleagues noted that “**fear**” of the “**Agenda 21**” label often resulted in the use of other, presumably less fearful, names:

“ESD is called different things at different levels. If ESD is mandated by the Federal Government, the group discussed whether it should be in the form of Local Agenda 21, Cities for Climate Protection or a more general ESD framework. There is fear from some councils of the LA21 label, so councils should adopt whichever definition or framework best suits their purpose at hand. Whilst it is time consuming for each council to invent its own definition of ESD, there are benefits in that the community will feel a greater sense of ownership of the concept.”

Any consideration of the public awareness of Agenda 21 must take into consideration this use of language, or spin and deception, to conceal the purpose of this program. Language is commonly used to destroy democracy by preventing the public from making an informed choice. As Ben Grono so aptly points out 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.”

The following discussion acknowledges the simple fact that both politicians, and the mainstream media, generally prefer to discuss “ESD” or “sustainable development”, and avoid the term “Agenda 21”, when publicly discussing the implications of the Agenda 21 program.

Evidence reveals the media have been engaged by the UN for the specific purpose of promoting this global sustainability agenda. While this may involve not mentioning the “Agenda 21” label, it also involves specific training courses as well as financial subsidies. An examination of the typical promotional spiel from the UN reveals that many media accounts do in fact share the UN version almost word for word. For instance, vital sections of Agenda 21 which refer to enforcement by national or sub-national governments are carefully avoided in both the UN spiel as well as media versions. Frequent political claims and media claims that Agenda 21 is ‘voluntary’ or ‘non-binding’ clearly omit more information than they include and are blatantly deceptive. The [claim by legal experts such as Ben Boer](#), that “Agenda 21 is not legally binding in international law” also omits more than it states, and clearly avoids mentioning the transition of soft law to hard law that occurs as practices become globally normalised.

Similarly, suggestions in UN publications that national sovereignty is an impediment to implementation of the Agenda 21 sustainability agenda and therefore must be replaced by “responsible sovereignty”, are also excluded from both the UN promotional spiel as well as being excluded from media statements. Similarly, the UN suggestion that the Agenda 21 sustainability agenda must avoid democratic rejection by a new democratically elected government (by being embedded within the executive or bureaucracy), also does not appear in the promotional spiel from either the UN or the media.

There are many examples of this media misinformation or deception, but its longstanding consistent nature, having continued for 24 years, makes Agenda 21 propaganda truly remarkable.

We have established, in some instances at least, that the media is simply doing what it was paid to do, namely rewrite UN news releases and recycle their promotional spiel. However, another explanation is also possible, namely political bias.

From the cited evidence above it is clear that Agenda 21 is part of a globalist agenda, and it utilises some of the fundamental tools of socialism, namely, wealth redistribution, collectivism, social equity, and global regulatory controls over private property, energy, and resources. This of course results in popularity with those who consider themselves to be on the left of the political spectrum, [as pointed out by Glover](#). While professional journalists should of course be capable of giving priority to the facts, and the public interest, as compared to their own personal political bias, the facts reveal that this frequently does not occur in reality. Political bias obviously pervades the media to such an extent that in many cases the views of particular journalists are entirely predictable. Of course this is no more an organised conspiracy than the fact that left wing journalists vote for left wing politicians! However, if there has been a ‘conspiracy’ as the media often seems to assert, then media silence on the facts pertaining to Agenda 21 would be hardly surprising. [As I have indicated previously](#):

“However, 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!”

Irrespective of the media’s consistent silence or misinformation about the negative consequences of the Agenda 21 agreement itself, the further question arises as to why the media has ignored the astonishing anti-democratic covert techniques which have been utilised by politicians to implement this agreement. The fact that such techniques have been used by successive Federal governments, State governments, and local Councils for 24 years makes this all the more alarming. And it certainly cannot be argued that Agenda 21 was intended to be a minor, perhaps inconsequential policy initiative. From the outset, it was always intended to be a massive, pervasive, and enduring initiative, **as then Environment Minister Ros Kelly admitted when she [introduced Agenda 21 to Australia in Parliament in 1993](#)**:

“Agenda 21 is a truly massive document—40 chapters covering matters as diverse as poverty, population, technology transfer, consumption patterns, forests, freshwater, pollution avoidance, trans boundary air pollution, and radioactive waste. It is a blueprint or set of guidelines, not just for individual countries but, importantly, for the entire United Nations system as well as for individuals and organisations of every size and type. Australia contributed significantly to its preparation and negotiations. The recommendations of agenda 21 cover a wide range of issues and responsibilities for implementation, cutting across virtually every Commonwealth and State government agency as well as local government and the non-government sector”

Significantly, when Prime Minister Julia Gillard attended the Rio+20 conference 20 years later [she announced Agenda 21 would be continued and expanded](#) under the new title of the Post-2015 Agenda and the Sustainable Development Goals, an agenda which is intended to [‘transform’ the world](#). As UNFCCC chief [Christiana Figueres pointed out](#) in regard to the UN’s global agenda, **the aim of the UN is to bring about a “centralized transformation”**.....*“one that is going to make the life of everyone on the planet very different.”* [Figueres continues](#): *“global society, is moving to the point where we are going to need more and more global governance muscle.....Climate change is only the first of the major, major planetary challenges that we are being given, almost as a playground.....to go into that playground and exercise our global governance capacity”*

Never has there been such a massive, consistent, and long lasting, failure of the media in this country, a failure

which continues to jeopardise Australian security, prosperity, national sovereignty, freedom, and democracy. Their failings are primarily twofold.

- 3. The media have chosen to ignore, or misinform the public about, the most massive, pervasive and enduring policy initiative in Australian history, one that successive governments and Councils around Australia admit they have been implementing for more than 2 decades.**
- 4. Media determination to ignore Agenda 21 also means the media have consistently condoned, and refused to expose, the anti-democratic mechanisms governments have utilised in an attempt to implement this imported anti-Australian program. The media has enabled successive governments to completely avoid democratic accountability.**

This is much too great a price to pay for media subservience to the UN, personal political bias within the media, or media incompetence.