

AUSTRALIA SURRENDERS!

Subversion of Democracy by Treaties & UN Controlled Local Community Groups, Councils, & NGO's

Graham Williamson

February 2013

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The purpose of this paper is to examine the status of Australian democracy and sovereignty under the constant assault from globalists and the UN. An examination of globally inspired threats to Australian democracy & sovereignty reveals the following facts.

- **The UN has adopted a 2 pronged attack upon national sovereignty & democracy involving both a top down government strategy as well as a bottom up community driven strategy.**
- The top down strategy involves the use of international treaties, incorporated into Australian legislation, to force compliance with UN dictates and thereby erode national sovereignty and democracy. **This strategy is well under way and our national sovereignty is being increasingly surrendered to the dictates of the UN as the Australian government continues to enforce UN treaties. This process, though effective, is considered too slow by those who prefer revolutionary change**
- The bottom up strategy is very extensive, involving a multitude of community groups, NGO's, and local Councils, all of which are driven by global UN programs, especially sustainability programs. **The explosion of these groups, and their subservience to the dictates of the UN, poses a very serious threat, not only to democracy & sovereignty, but to the Australian government itself. By responding to the UN, the Australian government and Constitution are effectively bypassed.**

There is no doubt Australia is steadily surrendering to political (& economic) control by the UN and globalists. While many recognise the top down strategy which has been popular with globalists for many years as a means of eroding national sovereignty, **the bottom up threat is exploding into a major but little recognised new threat. Agenda 21 is a central part of the UN bottom up movement.**

Most conspicuously, the threats to Australian democracy and sovereignty are aligned in one direction only, with seemingly a complete absence of practical moves to strengthen & preserve our democracy & sovereignty.

Introduction

The dream for those who want complete control is to destroy democracy and national sovereignty. We can see what a terrible frustration constitutional restrictions are to globalists and those seeking to enforce their will upon the majority in the **Pocket Guide to Sustainable Development Governance**, in the lead up to Rio +20 ([1](#)):

“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.”

Of course, in expressing their concern that decisions are made based upon *national interests rather than global concerns*, the UN is simply admitting that they should be making the decisions and they alone should also have the power to define *global concerns*.

Clearly, the fact that there is no evidence of significant global warming 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 ([2](#), [3](#), [4](#), [5](#), [6](#)). 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 ([7](#), [8](#), [9](#), [10](#)). As has been noted by Opeskin ([11](#)):

“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 ([7](#), [8](#), [12](#), [13](#)). 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 ([14](#)). When both major parties support selling Australia out to unelected undemocratic foreign agencies then democracy is dead ([16](#)):

“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](#) ([17](#), [18](#), [19](#),)& **Local Agenda 21 (LA21)** as spelt out in [Chapter 28 of Agenda 21](#) ([20](#), [21](#), [22](#), [23](#),[24](#), [25](#), [26](#), [27](#),[28](#), [29](#), [30](#), [31](#)) back in 1992 ([32](#), [33](#), [34](#), [35](#), [36](#), [37](#), [38](#), [39](#), [40](#)). The second, was the establishment of the **United Nations Parliamentary Assembly (UNPA)** in 2010 ([41](#), [42](#)).

Agenda 21 & Local Agenda 21 (LA21)

Local Agenda 21 (LA21)([Chapter 28 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 ([43](#), [44](#), [45](#), [46](#),[47](#), [48](#), [49](#), [50](#),[51](#),[52](#), [53](#), [54](#), [55](#), [56](#), [57](#), [58](#), [59](#), [60](#), [61](#), [62](#), [63](#), [64](#)). The UN has readily acknowledged the extraordinary success of the LA21 campaign for implementing their globalist policies around the world ([65](#)):

“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.”

Similarly, according to [Konrad Otto-Zimmermann Secretary General ICLEI](#):

1992-2012 - these two decades mark a global success story. What was kicked off by the call for “Local Agenda 21” at the 1992 Rio Earth Summit and ten years later reinvigorated by the launch of a decade of “Local Action 21” at the 2002 Johannesburg Summit has resulted in the largest ever movement of cities and local governments worldwide for a common purpose. About ten thousand local governments have engaged the local community and local stakeholders in a participatory, local, sustainable development process..... The two decades of local sustainability work have not only brought about tens of thousands of local initiatives and urban projects improving local and global environmental conditions.....”

According to the United Nations, [Chapter 28 of Agenda 21](#) requires that local authorities, as part of their new global role, enter into partnerships with “*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 ([66](#)).

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 ([67](#), [68](#), [69](#), [70](#), [71](#), [72](#)). 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 ([70](#), [73](#), [74](#), [75](#)).

Constitutional changes are proposed in 2 fundamental areas, firstly financial recognition, and secondly, democratic recognition of local governments ([67](#), [68](#), [69](#), [70](#), [71](#)). Proposals to support financial recognition seek to give the Commonwealth the power to fund local councils directly, thereby bypassing the States ([67](#), [68](#), [69](#), [70](#), [71](#)). The concern here is that local councils will be used to implement Commonwealth policy ([67](#), [68](#), [69](#), [70](#), [71](#)). Democratic recognition on the other hand, may remove or reduce the current power of State governments to supervise or dismiss local councils ([67](#), [68](#), [69](#), [70](#), [71](#)). According to the final report of the **Expert Panel of the Constitutional Recognition of Local Government**, there is limited bipartisan support for these changes ([70](#)):

“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 ([70](#)) “*unintended consequences*” such as possible High Court decisions preventing control of councils by state governments ([76](#), [78](#), [79](#), [80](#)). Concerns were also expressed about expanding centralism and an imbalance in Federal/State powers ([75](#)):

“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 (77):

“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.”

Local Community Groups & Non-Government Organisations

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 of Implementation of Agenda 21 and the Rio Principles](#):

“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.”

Ron Boswell, in his paper, [The Greenmailing of Primary Producers](#), has recently drawn attention to the alarming rise in the power of NGO's in Australia and the ways in which they are subverting democracy and freedom:

“Environmental non-government organisations, or ENGOs, are gaining increased influence over the way Australia's vital primary products are harvested and marketed. The ways in which they are doing this put into question the future role of government, science and rational resource management in Australian primary production.

One of the ENGOs' major strategies has been the establishment of “certification” schemes, whereby primary producers must enter costly arrangements to prove to the satisfaction of the particular ENGO that their production methods and outcomes meet certain standards of environmental sustainability. Thus primary producers can effectively be forced to pay money to continue in business by signing up to the ENGO's preferred sustainability body..... The growth of these certification bodies highlights an apparent abdication of responsibility by the current federal government for making important decisions about primary production. It also represents a direct attack on science and the role of scientists in decision-making in primary production and other areas. It also belittles the role of experienced resource managers and potentially sidelines them..... It is by no means far-fetched to say that WWF and other ENGOs fully intend that eventually all food and fibre products harvested in Australia will be forced to go through one of these lucrative “sustainability certification” schemes. Every food and fibre product. Every single one. These schemes cost individual producers thousands of dollars for the initial certification process and then regular costs for auditing..... Clearly, environmental non-government organisations like WWF, Greenpeace and others intend to move from one primary industry sector to the next to the next, “greenmailing” them or otherwise forcing them to comply with their favoured sustainability certification schemes. Their tactics should alarm all Australians.

I believe these tactics raise questions of fundamental importance for the way government operates, for the maintenance of a genuine, informed democracy, and for the role of science in guiding and informing decision-making.”

Disturbingly, [Boswell asks](#):

“Who is running this country? Clearly, not the current government. It looks more like mob rule. Scientists and resource managers must be seething with anger and frustration as sound long-term advice is overruled by expedient short-term politics. What we see from some green groups in fact is anti-science. Science is complex and rational. The ENGO messages are inevitably simple and emotional: “Save this, save that, save the other ... donate now.”

Of course governments of both political parties have been selling Australia out and surrendering to the UN for more than two decades. [Boswell cites](#) former Australian Ambassador to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, Alan Oxley:

“WWF has made no secret of its strategy to pressure companies occupying strategic positions in the supply chain, such as dominant consumer goods manufacturers and retailers, to adopt its certification standards. Other NGOs, like Greenpeace and the Rainforest Action Network, are aggressively attacking brand names and leading products of major companies to incentivise them to join the strategy ...

ENGOs will also engage a method often referred to as “greenmail” to force companies into certification. “Greenmail” involves action to devalue the public perception of a brand name or company reputation of producers and retailers through advocacy campaigns aimed at consumers and processors. Running negative campaigns against brand labels with significant market position is common. The aim is to pressure these businesses to align with or adopt certification systems developed by NGOs. Once the company adopts that system, it has become an agent for delivering the sustainability values of the NGO. By these means, ENGOs are able to influence, and even control, the supply chain.

The rise of NGO’s and community groups in response to global initiatives of the UN is also typified by the emergence of numerous community groups and programs such as sustainable cities and transition towns ([81](#), [82](#), [83](#), [84](#), [85](#), [86](#), [90](#), [91](#), [92](#), [93](#), [94](#)), though there are “hundreds” or “thousands” ([85](#)) of similar organisations. Many of these local initiatives are supported by [ICLEI](#), an Agenda 21 promoting organisation ([87](#), [88](#), [89](#)). In fact, [Section 7.21 of Agenda 21](#), specifically recommends involvement with ICLEI.

The threat to democracy in Australia from NGO’s and community groups is very real, and is a threat which is being effectively exploited by globalists and foreign agencies such as the UN. As pointed out by [Boswell](#), immediate action is needed.

“What’s to be done? The government must speak out on behalf of Australia’s primary producers and the sustainability of their farming, forestry and fishing practices. Then it must take action to back up those words. It must support our wealth-creating, job-creating primary industries in the marketplace. In other words, it must refute the lies the ENGOs are telling about our primary producers.

Then, these ENGOs must be made accountable. For example, the government should urgently re-examine the exemption of ENGOs from the secondary boycott provision of the Consumer and Competition Act, for example where ENGOs encourage the boycott of products not carrying the “sustainability certification” label they prefer.

The government should also examine what looks to be a free ride for activists who take apparently illegal actions but use the excuse that they were protecting the environment.

And why do these “big environment” organisations—who seem able to spend millions and millions of dollars lobbying government and running advertising, PR and social media campaigns to influence public opinion—enjoy tax-free charity status? In most cases, they can massively out-spend the companies they campaign against, companies who must comply with taxation and other rules that simply do not apply to the ENGOs.

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. Democracy and sovereignty in this country is being effectively subverted by globally controlled organisations and activist groups. Australia is steadily surrendering control to the UN.

The United Nations Parliamentary Assembly (UNPA)

The UNPA (95, 96), 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 (97, 98, 99). 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 (99):

*"- 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 (99):

"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.....