

USURPING DEMOCRACY & SOVEREIGNTY

Upcoming Constitutional Referendum: More Power to Government or More Power to the People?

Graham Williamson

October 2012

Greens & Government Want Referendum to Gain More Control Over Local Councils

The current Labor government plans to conduct a referendum at the next election to constitutionally recognise and give more rights to local councils ([1](#), [2](#), [3](#), [4](#), [5](#), [6](#)). The commitment to hold a referendum was part of an agreement signed by the Greens Party and the ALP in order to form government ([4](#), [6](#), [7](#)).

Constitutional changes are proposed in 2 fundamental areas, firstly financial recognition, and secondly, democratic recognition of local governments ([1](#), [3](#), [4](#), [5](#)). Proposals to support financial recognition seek to give the Commonwealth the power to fund local councils directly, thereby bypassing the States ([1](#), [3](#), [4](#), [5](#)). The concern here is that local councils will be used to implement Commonwealth policy ([1](#), [3](#), [4](#), [5](#)). Democratic recognition on the other hand, may remove or reduce the current power of State governments to supervise or dismiss local councils ([1](#), [3](#), [4](#), [5](#)). According to the final report of the **Expert Panel of the Constitutional Recognition of Local Government**, there is limited bipartisan support for these changes ([4](#)):

“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 ([4](#)) “unintended consequences” such as possible High Court decisions preventing control of councils by state governments. Concerns were also expressed about expanding Federalism and an imbalance in Federal/State powers.

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

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

Similarly, according to Twomey ([94](#)):

“Despite many years of agitation, there still does not appear to be a cogent argument for why the recognition of local government in the Constitution is actually needed, other than to make local

councillors feel important and appreciated. At best, the underlying argument appears to be that it might allow more money to be wheedled out of Commonwealth coffers on the basis that direct funding will give the Commonwealth more kudos and vote-buying for its buck. This is not a particularly noble reason for amending the Constitution and should be resisted.”

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

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

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

There is however another less publicised and even more worrying aspect of the government’s push for constitutional recognition of local government.

Agenda 21 and the Rise of Bottom Up Political Movements

Since the inception of Agenda 21 in 1992 the United Nations has been promoting bottom up political movements through local councils and community groups, often referred to as Local Agenda 21 or simply LA 21. [LA21, the local government application of Agenda 21](#), has been widely adopted by Councils throughout Australia who therefore now act as agents of the UN actively implementing UN policy in Australia at the local community level even though Australians have never been given a democratic choice ([61](#), [62](#), [63](#), [64](#), [65](#),[66](#), [67](#), [68](#), [69](#),[70](#),[71](#), [72](#), [73](#), [74](#), [75](#), [76](#), [77](#), [78](#), [79](#), [80](#), [81](#), [82](#), [83](#)). The UN has readily acknowledged the extraordinary success of the LA21 campaign for implementing their globalist policies around the world ([84](#)):

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

The United Nations recognises that to achieve its aims there must be a complete restructuring of power in the world with national borders, independence and sovereignty gradually broken down as power and control is increasingly surrendered to a global authority. Part of this process is to reverse the power structure within countries to give more global recognition to local authorities and councils. According to Chapter 8 of Agenda 21 ([8](#)) the aim is the *“delegating of planning and management responsibilities to the lowest level of public authority consistent with effective action.”* So the United Nations, with their long term agenda for complete global control, is issuing directives directly at local councils. The United Nations have listed their requirements for local councils in more detail in chapter 28 of Agenda 21 ([9](#)):

“The following objectives are proposed for this program area:

(a) By 1996, most local authorities in each country should have undertaken a consultative process with their populations and achieved a consensus on "a local Agenda 21" for the community;

(b) By 1993, the international community should have initiated a consultative process aimed at increasing cooperation between local authorities;

(c) By 1994, representatives of associations of cities and other local authorities should have increased levels of cooperation and coordination with the goal of enhancing the exchange of information and experience among local authorities;

(d) All local authorities in each country should be encouraged to implement and monitor programs which aim at ensuring that women and youth are represented in decision-making, planning and implementation processes.”

According to the Australian government LA 21 guide [\(13\)](#):

“In 1992, the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development (UNCED), known as the Earth Summit, developed Agenda 21, a blueprint for action to achieve sustainable development. Agenda 21 called upon governments around the world to take a course of action to implement that blueprint. Local Agenda 21 comes from Chapter 28 of that blueprint.”

Though Agenda 21 further suggests that [\(9\)](#) “each local authority should enter into a dialogue with its citizens, local organizations and private enterprises and adopt a local Agenda 21”, it would appear that most Australian councils have communicated the far reaching aspects of Agenda 21 to their constituents very poorly as most citizens seem to have very little awareness of this process. Amazingly, like their Federal and State government counterparts, local government apparently also decided not to educate their constituents, either about the totality or long term goals of Agenda 21, or about its United Nations origins. In fact, the name of the LA 21 program is often changed to conceal the true global initiatives. Even though ecologically sustainable development in Australia is enforced by law [\(10\)](#), the public have yet to be made aware of either its UN Agenda 21 origins or the totality of its global goals. In spite of this public ignorance, it seems local authorities and councils have been the most effective organisations for implementing the requirements of Agenda 21 [\(11, 12\)](#).

According to the United Nations, Agenda 21 requires that local authorities, as part of their new global role, enter into partnerships with [\(9\)](#) “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* [\(14\)](#):

“Sustainability offices, under the auspices of the ICLEI’s [Local Governments for Sustainability](#), are the tiny, visible tip of the monstrous Agenda 21 sustainable development iceberg, the ultimate goal of which is to transform American society from the bottom up into a socialist ward of UN global governance.”

Bottom up political groups may clearly respond to external agencies such as the UN without the same limitations of sovereignty or the constitution as binds the Commonwealth government. In this way the Constitution may be completely subverted.

We can see what a terrible frustration constitutional restrictions are to globalists and those seeking to enforce their will upon the majority. According to the **Pocket Guide to Sustainable Development**

Governance, in the lead up to Rio +20 ([27](#)):

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

Given the restrictions of national constitutions it is hardly surprising that according to the [United Nations Sustainable Development in the 21st Century Summary for Policymakers](#), the future of globalisation is largely dependent upon giving more power and recognition to local councils:

“Empowering lower levels with means to act on their own

*Progress towards more sustainable outcomes does not need to wait for a hypothetical consensus on what the future of the world should be, or how global affairs should be managed. Actions at lower levels can and should be taken as soon as possible.....**Empower lower levels of governments to act as agents of change on their own and try new approaches to sustainability....**Local governments also have a critical role to play as agents of change, as their closeness to their constituents enable them to embark on bold experiments of different paths to sustainability..... Providing appropriate mandates and resources to all levels of governments Ultimately, the success or failure of sustainable development will largely depend on decisions and actions that are taken at the local level. This was well recognized by Agenda 21.”*

But the UN went further in their [Review of Implementation of Agenda 21 and the Rio Principles \(Draft – Jan 2012\)](#), even suggesting that local governments should be empowered by state and federal governments to communicate directly with the United Nations:

“All governance levels from local through global need to be vertically interconnected for bottom-up energy to meet top-down support. In order to bridge the gaps between different levels of governance well as between agenda and action, local governments need to be given a more prominent role in global UN processes. The intergovernmental level should recognize that local authorities have similar legitimacy compared to national governments, and with many local authorities governing bigger populations than the 150 smallest UN member states, it would be reasonable if they could get voting rights in the UN. New institutional arrangements for sustainability should be based on a multi-level concept of governance and include elected representatives from local, sub-national, national, regional and ultimately global levels. In the other direction, it is imperative that decentralization policies are accompanied with all the needed political, legal and financial support that local authorities need for implementing their localized strategies for sustainability.”

The UNPA – the United Nations Parliamentary Assembly & the Usurping of Democracy & Sovereignty

In order to establish a global authority which would be unhindered by the constitutional limitations of nation states, in 2010 the United Nations established the United Nations Parliamentary Assembly or UNPA ([15](#), [19](#)), of which Bob Brown and Sarah Hansen Young are both members. The UNPA, as represented by Bob Brown ([20](#); Bob Brown has declined to answer my repeated query as to whether he intends to remain an active member of UNPA), 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(16, 17, 18). The (17) *“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.”*

These global changes will progressively undermine national sovereignty and promote the formation of a world government (18):

“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.”

National independence and sovereignty are considered counterproductive to those who seek to impose their views upon the entire human race (18);

“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.”

A global environmental authority has been suggested as an ideal means of beginning the establishment of a global citizen’s organisation and ultimately a world government (17, 18, 19).

Given the desire of the UN to facilitate their global governance aspirations by encouraging local groups in opposition to the Commonwealth government, the threat posed by indiscriminate empowerment of local government is very real indeed.

The proposed referendum should be rejected until sufficient safeguards, empowering the people and safeguarding sovereignty, are inserted in the constitution.

What we need first and foremost are positive changes to the Constitution to prevent interference from foreign agencies, protect freedom and democracy, and increase political accountability.