

The Dark Agenda: Agendas 21 and 30, the Trojan Horse for Global, Centralised and Totalitarian-Fascist Control of All the World's Resources and Activities—Including You

by Neil Hamley (updated Feb. 2020, www.spiritualityandsoul.com)

1. Introduction to Agendas 21 and 30.

“Sustainable Development is a Trojan Horse that looks good on the outside but is filled with highly toxic and militant policies on the inside.”—Patrick Wood, *Technocracy Rising: The Trojan Horse of Global Transformation*. [34 p. 97].

Agenda 21: United Nations Sustainable Development, commonly known as Agenda 21, and its successor, *Transforming Our World: The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development*, commonly known as Agenda30, are apparently benevolent UN policy documents which serve as the guiding basis or blueprints for the establishment of economically and ecologically sustainable and socially just communities throughout the world. [4; 5]. The central message of these documents is this: through human mismanagement and over consumption we now have a world in crisis characterised by scarce or rapidly diminishing resources, increasing environmental degradation and dangers—in particular man-made or anthropogenic global warming (now re-badged as climate change)—and great economic and social inequity and inequality, therefore, we need to implement a new and global political, economic, social and ecological system which will insure both economic and environmental and sustainability as well as economic and social equity or justice and equality. In actuality, Agendas 21 and 30 are a trojan horse for: the progressive rollout of a world-wide monitoring and measuring system of *all* of the world's resources and activities, including people and their activities; the progressive ownership and control of all resources and activities by governments in collusion with mega-corporations and, as always, the mega-banks behind these corporations; and the progressive centralisation of political power and control over the world through the United Nations (UN) or, much more specifically, the mega-wealthy individuals and groups which have *always* more or less controlled the UN from within the shadows. Rather than providing the foundation for a promised utopian future—a healthy environment, a prosperous economy, the end of poverty and scarcity, more equal distribution of the world's wealth and resources, social justice for women, children and indigenous groups, peace, and partnership—beneath this high-sounding language and nice-looking facade Agendas 21 and 30 contain more or less hidden principles, policies, plans and programs for the progressive and insidious rollout of a dystopian, global, centralised, fascist and totalitarian regime run through an incestuous alliance of government and mega- or transnational-corporations and banks. This *is* the dark agenda hidden behind and within Agendas 21 and 30.

2. A Brief History of Agendas 21 and 30.

This paper will mainly focus on the implementation of Agendas 21 and 30 in Australia and the US. However, much of what is said here is, or will be, applicable to the implementation of these Agendas in most other countries; for all countries are using the same blueprints embodying the same recommendations, and all countries are being more or less continually guided, influenced and coerced by the UN in the implementation of these Agendas. I will begin with a brief history of Agendas 21 and 30 in Australia and the USA, and then move on to a detailed consideration of the nefarious aspects of their nature and implementation.

Agenda 21 is an approximately 350-page policy document which was prepared for, and which was the culmination of, the UN Conference on Environment and Development held in Rio de Janeiro in 1992—also known as the Earth Summit. Commitment to its implementation was signed-off by 179 countries including Australia by the then prime minister Paul Keating. Agenda 30 is a much shorter 41-page document. Agenda 30 does *not* replace Agenda 21. The former explicitly states that it builds on the solid foundation of former UN summits including the UN Conference of Environment and Development held in Rio de Janeiro in 1992

which, we may add, produced Agenda 21. [5, Section 11]. The essential defining feature of Agenda 30 is that it adds a series of 17 specific goals, called Sustainable Development Goals (SDG), along with 169 related targets, to facilitate the implementation of Agenda 21. Agenda 30 was signed off in 2015 by 193 countries, including Australia by the then Foreign Minister Julie Bishop. Both Agendas are pledges and not legally binding treaties, however, we shall see that through a variety of means, including legislation, they are being progressively implemented and enforced in signatory countries.

2.1 A Brief History of the Implementation of Agendas 21 and 30 in Australia

Perhaps the best starting point for developing one's understanding of Agendas 21 and 30 in Australia, including their history, is a series of papers written by Graham Williamson and which can still be found at the website galileomovement.com.au [12; 13; 27; 28; 29; 30; 31; 32]. The following history draws heavily on these papers. Legally, Agenda 21 is implemented in Australia under the *1992 Intergovernmental Agreement on the Environment* and the *National Strategy for Ecologically Sustainable Development* introduced in 1992 by the Keating government. [12; 30]. In 1998 a report by the Productivity Commission entitled the *Implementation of Ecologically Sustainable Development by Commonwealth Departments and Agencies* noted that the principles of Ecologically Sustainable development (ESD) had already been thoroughly embedded into Australia's bureaucracy. [12]. In 1999 the *Environmental Protection and Biodiversity Act* was introduced, one of the aims of which was to further embed the principles of ESD into Commonwealth/Federal laws. This Act also further enforced compliance with "international obligations" such as Agenda 21, as admitted by the *Independent Review of the Environment Protection & Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999*. [13].

In 1999 Senators Robert Hill and Ian MacDonald, of the Howard government, officially launched the Commonwealth/Federal government's Agenda 21 instruction manual for local councils entitled *Our Community Our Future: A Guide to Local Agenda 21*. This launch was also reported in the February 2000 edition of *Local Government Focus* when Senator MacDonald announced that the Commonwealth was driving the implementation of LA21 at the local council level by providing funds. (The implementation of Agenda 21 at the local level is often referred to as LA21.) In 2002 local government organisations met in Adelaide, at the Sustaining Our Communities International Local Agenda 21 Conference, to further commit to the implementation of Local Agenda 21 (LA21). In the May 2003 edition of *Local Government Focus* then Environment Minister, David Kemp, confirmed his satisfaction with the implementation of Agenda 21 by councils around Australia. [12; 31]. *Wikipedia* states that at present there are 88 Australian councils involved with ICLEI, or the International Council for Local Environmental Initiatives, which has had a major role in the local implementation of Agenda 21. (ICLEI has been renamed Local Governments for Sustainability.) ICLEI's own website (icleioceania.org) shows that these councils include the cities of Sydney, Melbourne, Brisbane, Adelaide, Hobart and Perth. [9]. I will have a lot more to say about ICLEI in due course.

The United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development, also known as Rio + 20, was held in 2011. In 2012 the Australian Government pointed out in their *Road to Rio+20* fact sheet that "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." [13].

As stated, in 2015 Australia signed off on Agenda 30. The Australian government's coordination of its implementation at the national level is being led by the Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade (DFAT) and the Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet, in collaboration with individual departments for each individual sustainable development goal. [16]. In 2018 Australia's voluntary national review examining SDG developments, *Report On the Implementation of the Sustainable Development Goals 2018*, was conducted by DFAT. [21]. At the start of the Report it is announced that "Australia is committed to the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) as a universal, global approach to reduce poverty, promote sustainable development and ensure the peace and prosperity of people across the world." [21 p. 6]. Further,

the Report states, “Since the SDGs were formally adopted, the Australian Government has convened an inter-departmental group of senior officials with portfolio responsibilities that link to one or more of the SDGs and separate cross-government groups on specific aspects such as data or communications. The senior officials group, co-chaired by the Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet (PM&C) and the Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade (DFAT), provides coordination on how to best give effect to the 2030 Agenda, domestically and internationally, including for the drafting of this Review. Through this mechanism, the Government is collaborating with domestic stakeholders to promote and monitor Australia’s progress.” [21 p. 7]. The inter-departmental group referred to here is the Intergovernmental Committee on Ecologically Sustainable Development which is the peak, officials-level, forum for coordination of ecologically sustainable development related strategies and policies which effect Federal, State, Territory, and local government jurisdictions. [31]. Further, the Report states “There is a large body of legislation, regulation and policy at national and sub-national level that drives us towards many of the outcomes enshrined in the SDGs. This is an ongoing and dynamic process.” [21 p. 13]. The Report, and other sources, show a wide range of organisations are currently involved in the development and implementation of SDGs in Australia including the Australian Council for International Development, the Global Compact Network Australia, the Sustainable Development Solutions Network Australia, the Australian Council of Social Services, and the United Nations Association of Australia. [16; 21 pp. 9-10].

In the *Report on the Implementation of the Sustainable Development Goals 2018* Senator Concetta Fierravanti-Wells states that SDGs reflect the values of Australians, in particular the idea of a ‘fair go.’ This is true enough; the SDGs do reflect many Australian values. But, the real purpose of the SDG rollout, and more generally Agenda 30, is antithetical, and repugnant, to what all but a few Australians value.

In sum, we see that Agenda 21 and 30 policies have been progressively rolled out across Australia for nearly three decades, and yet most Australians have never heard of these Agendas. Irrespective of the political apathy of many Australians, this fact alone should begin to arouse suspicion that there is a secretive and insidious nature to these policies.

2.2. A Brief History of the Implementation of Agendas 21 and 30 in the USA. In 1992 President George H.W. Bush signed off on Agenda 21 for the US. In 1995 President Bill Clinton signed Executive Order #12852 to create the President’s Council on Sustainable Development (PCSD) in order to harmonize US environmental policy with UN directives as outlined in Agenda 21. The PCSD’s 25 members included most Cabinet Secretaries, representatives from The Nature Conservancy, the Sierra Club and other non-government organizations, and a few representatives from industry. This executive order directed all agencies of the Federal Government to work with State and local community governments in a joint effort to “reinvent” government using the guidelines outlined in Agenda 21. The PCSD set out to implement the recommendations of Agenda 21 administratively, where possible, and to secure new legislation when necessary. [14; 6]. The PCSD produced its own book, *Sustainable America*, which personalised Agenda 21 policies for the US. [34 p. 90]. The federal government also provided funds to the American Planning Association to develop model legislation for the States to implement Agenda 21. The outcome was the document entitled *Growing Smart Legislative Guidebook: Model Statutes for Planning and the Management of Change*. Typically, this legislation, when adopted, requires the creation of a state-wide comprehensive land use plan that defines the administrative mechanisms for regional government agencies, and provides planning models for counties to use in creating county-wide land use plans. Further, using the coercive power of the federal budget, which the PCSD describes as using financial incentives and disincentives, the federal government has had little trouble getting States to rush to adopt some form of this model legislation. In particular, the US Environmental Protection Authority (EPA) provided challenge grants and visioning grants to communities that would undertake the process toward sustainability. Grants were also made available to selected non-government organizations, such as ICLEI, to launch a visioning process in local communities. This process relies on a trained facilitator who uses a consensus building model to lead selected community participants in the development of a community vision. This vision inevitably sets forth a set of goals—each of which can be found in the recommendations of Agenda 21—that become the basis for the development of a comprehensive community plan. (As we shall see in due course, the visioning

process just outlined is actually designed *to circumvent* and *subvert* democratically elected and accountable local government officials and also true community participation and representation.) Also non-elected regional bodies such as the regional Councils of Government, and the Metropolitan Planning Organisations, which collectively have around 900 regional groups blanketing the US, were given the power to distribute funds to counties and cities *if* they adopted sustainable development policies. With the assistance of the aforementioned groups and others like the American Planning Council, Renaissance Planning Group, International City/County Management Group, U.S. Mayors Conference, National Governors Association, National League of Cities, and the National Association of County Administrators, sustainable development is now emerging as government policy in every town, county and State in the US. [6; 14; 65 p .80-4, 96-7]. By 2012 Agenda 21 was already operating in 600 towns and cities across the US. [7 p. 622]. Then Prime Minister Tony Blair told the UN General Assembly Special Session on the Environment in 1997 “I want all local authorities in the UK to adopt local Agenda 21 strategies by the year 2000.” [7 p. 623]. By 2012 Agenda 21 was being rolled out in 7,800 cities world wide [1].

3. Hiding the Existence of Agendas 21 and 30 from the General Public.

Most Australians and Americans have never heard of Agendas 21 and 30. While their general lack of political awareness accounts for some of this, there are two further reasons. First, a variety of terms and phrases designating and describing the principles, policies, programs and processes of Agendas 21 and 30, but which do not explicitly name these Agendas, are used. They include: “sustainability”, “STAR sustainable communities”, “consensus” and “participatory” decision making, “facilitators” (for such decision making), “resiliency”, “resilient cities”, “smart cities”, “smart growth”, “regional visioning projects”, “local visioning”, “green jobs”, “green building codes”, “going green”, “alternative energy”, “regional planning”, “comprehensive planning”, “historic preservation”, “conservation easements”, and “growth management.” There is a second and related reason why most people haven’t heard of Agendas 21 and 30: fear of opposition to their rollout has resulted in deliberately renaming them. Here is a quote from J. Gary Lawrence, an advisor to President Clinton’s Council on Sustainable Development, which confirms this point: “Participating in a UN advocated planning process would very likely bring out many of the conspiracy-fixated groups and individuals in our society.... This segment of our society who fear ‘one-world government’ and a UN invasion of the United States through which our individual freedoms would be stripped away would actively work to defeat any elected official who joined ‘the conspiracy’ by undertaking LA21. *So we call our process something else, such as comprehensive planning, growth management or smart growth.*” (My italics). [6]. Lawrence’s fear was well-founded, for there is now widespread opposition to Agendas 21 and 30 in the US due to their fundamentally undemocratic nature and the threat they pose to basic human rights, especially property rights. So far, resolutions opposing Agenda 21 have been proposed or passed in the states of Wyoming, Montana, Minnesota, Washington, Oklahoma, Iowa, Texas, South Dakota, Wisconsin and Arkansas. [31]. In due course, we shall see that these threats are real and not just in the minds of so-called conspiracy theorists.

4. An Overview of the Political, Economic, Environmental and Social System or Order Prescribed by Agendas 21 and 30.

In the introduction to this paper a brief description of the overall nature of Agendas 21 and 30 was given. It was stated that the central message of these Agendas was that in a time of world crisis characterised by scarce or rapidly diminishing resources, increasing environmental degradation and dangers—in particular anthropogenic global warming (now climate change)—and great economic and social inequity and inequality, Agendas 21 and 30 are blueprints for the establishment of a new and global political, economic, social and ecological order which will ensure both economic and environmental and sustainability as well as economic and social equality and justice. At this juncture I would like to provide a more detailed description of what *I believe* is the *actual* nature of the new system or order prescribed by Agendas 21 and 30, namely, a dystopian, global, centralised, fascist and totalitarian regime run through an incestuous alliance of government and mega and transnational corporations and banks. As this paper unfolds, I will provide increasing evidence for this conclusion. However, for the moment, I merely wish to provide an overview of

this system or regime to provide the context, framework and orientation for the ensuing discussion of these Agendas.

Before doing so, I would like to briefly mention one point. Agendas 21 and 30 are premised on the assertion that the world is in an environmental crisis which must be remedied. There is no doubt that we have caused and continue to cause a great deal of environmental damage, and this needs fixing. This is not in dispute. However, what is greatly disputed is the extent and nature of this damage. In particular, we have the recent advent of the theory that global warming, now climate change, and the increased droughts that are supposed to result, is caused by increased carbon dioxide emissions from human activity. This is not the time to go into an in-depth analysis of supposed man-made or anthropogenic global warming. For those who would like to explore this subject more they may choose to read my paper *The Global Warming Hoax*. Suffice to say at this point, the evidence is clear that from the time of life on this planet, an estimated 4.25 billion years ago, up to the present moment, the climate has fluctuated greatly. In particular, carbon dioxide levels have fluctuated greatly and they are *not* correlated with, and hence causative of, higher temperatures. What is important to note for the purposes of this paper is that Agendas 21 and 30 largely ride on the back of the global warming hoax where the mantra is that to prevent catastrophic global warming we must take drastic measures which, of course, Agendas 21 and 30 purport to provide. Catastrophic global warming is the problem and Agendas 21 and 30 are the solution—but nothing could be further from the truth.

Here then is the dark agenda of Agendas 21 and 30 in more detail. Under the multi-coloured guise of sustainability, equity and equality a new global or world system or order is being implemented under Agendas 21 and 30 where political control is being progressively vested and centralised in the UN and, more specifically, in the hands of a mega-rich banking and corporate cabal behind the UN and who control it. Political control will radiate out from this centre to in turn control national governments and their sub-national layers of government. For this to occur, a legal framework at the international, national and sub-national levels is progressively being constructed and which is progressively removing national sovereignty and vesting real power in the UN. Through this new political and legal structure the UN, that is, the people who really control the UN, will progressively introduce a new economic system. Capitalism based on a free-market, and the production and consumption patterns which occur under this system, will be progressively replaced; for this system, according to the proponents of Agendas 21 and 30, is neither sustainable nor just and results in inequalities. Instead, sustainability, equity and equality for all, as determined by government, will be the over-arching principle and means for governing production and consumption in the new economic order. Economic development and activity must now occur in a way which is not only economically prosperous but also environmentally sustainable and socially equitable, and this can only be insured through government control. This will occur through a series of inter-related policies and mechanisms to prevent unsustainable and inequitable production, consumption and distribution and to promote their opposites. These policies and mechanisms will include: increasing deregulation of international trade and commerce; increasing governmental (international, national and sub-national) laws and regulations with associated penalties; taxation including carbon taxes; tariffs; rationing; restrictions; and public-private partnerships (PPP). Collectively, these measures will work to progressively remove all resources from private ownership and control—with the great exception of major corporations and banks—to public-corporate ownership and control. Public-private partnerships (PPP) are where the government grants funding and special privileges to selected corporations because they supposedly use what are deemed sustainable and equitable practices. This is effectively fascism or the seamless merging and collusion of government and corporations; where finance from both is used; where decision-making is shared by both; where the interests of both, often synonymous, are served; and where there is often cross-membership. PPPs will inevitably result in monopolies and oligopolies as selected and favoured government corporations ‘compete’ unequally with the many smaller players. Monopolies and oligopolies will also inevitably result as transnational corporations, free of all regulation, continue to grow. As always, the inevitable outcome of corporate monopolies and oligopolies is higher prices for the general population. In the new system or order, the free market will not determine prices and patterns of production and consumption, rather, they will be directly or indirectly regulated by government in collusion with relatively few corporations, supposedly to insure sustainable development and social equity. This will be the end of free-market capitalism.

As resources increasingly come under the ownership and control of government and major corporations the flip side is that individual and private property ownership and property rights, and more generally individual rights (which depend in large measure on property rights), will progressively disappear. If individuals (or smaller companies) do own property what they can do with it will be strictly restricted and curtailed. Under the new system individual and private property ownership and individual rights cannot be allowed on any appreciable scale for supposedly both will be used in ways that generate unsustainability, inequity and inequality. Instead, property ownership, property rights and rights in general will be progressively transferred to and vested in the government and their allied corporations who are supposedly upholding the rights of the *community* by ensuring sustainable and just development. Another way of saying this is that in order to protect the environment and its resources, and to promote sustainability, restrictions and control will be progressively placed on all human activities and movements. Indeed, the human population will be dramatically decreased over time to around one to three billion in order to ease pressure on resources and the environment. Further, for the same reasons, humans will be progressively restricted to relatively small geographical areas called “human settlement zones.” The remaining area will be given over to what are termed “wilderness areas”. In sum, we see that individual freedoms and rights will be progressively removed because individuals, when free, supposedly act in ways which do *not* lead to sustainable and just outcomes. Instead, individual rights will need to progressively be abandoned in favour of community rights—in essence the community’s rights to things such as sustainable development, equity and equality—as *determined by governments in collusion with corporations, and ultimately by the UN and those who control it.*

Democratic government will also need to be abandoned, for through democracy people vote to have individual rights and vote to do things which may not be sustainable or equitable, especially to groups who are outside of the area of democratically elected representation. Democratically elected government, representation and accountability will be destroyed through a combined process of: increasingly vesting legal power in international laws overseen by the UN and which override national sovereignty; through the creation of new regional bodies and structures—which do not coincide with existing governmental and legal boundaries—and which are *not* democratically elected but which nonetheless wield real power over decision making; through governments giving some of their power regarding development, infrastructure, etc. to large corporations as part of public-private partnerships; and through elected government officials acting in the interests of corporations and banks and not the general population.

Finally, for all the world’s resources and activities to be managed and controlled, supposedly in a sustainable manner, they will need to be closely and continuously monitored, surveilled and measured—of course this will include all human resources and activities. This will require a massive, world-wide and centralised data/information collection and analysis system which, again, will be ultimately controlled through the centralised government of the UN.

Let me try to distil the black essence of Agendas 21 and 30. In an *implicit* way these documents declare that the existing political, economic and social order, characterised by democracy, individual property ownership, individual rights and the free market, *inevitably* results in environmental degradation and unsustainability, and social and economic injustice and inequality, therefore, a new world order characterised by a centralised, top-down political system centred in the United Nations will be progressively introduced, which will use technology to monitor, measure and control all of the world’s resources activities, especially human resources and activities, to ensure ecological sustainability, economic prosperity, and social and economic justice and equality for all. But, in *reality* this new world order will be the progressive and insidious implementation of a global, totalitarian-fascist regime of monitoring and control for the benefit of the few—the mega-wealthy owners of transnational banks and corporations—and their sycophants—who actually control the UN.

What I have just outlined is what I called the dark agenda of Agendas 21 and 30. Step by step I will bring forth the evidence to show that this is the actual or true nature of Agenda 21 and its successor, Agenda 30.

5. Agendas 21 and 30 are Blueprints for a Global, All-Encompassing and Centralised System

A reading of Agendas 21 and 30 clearly reveals that their application is meant to be all-encompassing—global in scope and reaching into and influencing all aspects of society, all levels of government, all resource ownership and management, and all people. Something of this extensive scope was recognised by Ros Kelly, then Environment Minister, when she introduced Agenda 21 in the Australian Parliament on 26th May 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.... 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...” [32]. What Kelly omitted to further mention was the *centralised* nature of Agenda 21, where the UN would have the central role in directing its global rollout and the central role in governing the system that Agenda 21 will put into place. Let us look further at the global, all-encompassing, and centralised nature of Agendas 21 and 30.

5.1. Agenda 21 and 30 are Blueprints for a Global and All-Encompassing System. In Chapter 38 of Agenda 21 entitled International Institutional Arrangements, the *global* nature of Agenda 21 is clearly stated: “The overall objective is the integration of environment and development issues at national, subregional, regional and international levels, including in the United Nations system institutional arrangements.” [Ch. 38, Sec. 7]. The global nature of Agenda 21, where it reaches into every aspect of society is clearly and quickly revealed by browsing at the Contents pages of the Agenda. Section 1 entitled Social and Economic Dimensions has chapters on poverty, consumption patterns, population (demographics), health, decision making processes, and “human settlements.” Section 2 entitled Conservation and Management of Resources for Development has chapters which cover the management of *all* resources including the atmosphere, land, forests, seas, freshwater, ecosystems, deserts, mountains, agriculture, biological diversity, biotechnology, rural development, and toxic substances and wastes. Section 3 entitled Strengthening the Role of Major Groups shows the intent of the Agenda to involve all major groups and organisations in society including children, women, youth, the indigenous, non-governmental organisations, local government, trade unions, industry, scientific and technology groups, and farmers. The final Section, Means of Implementation, shows that the Agenda means to reach into education, financial resources and mechanisms, legal frameworks, science, education and national and international institutional arrangements. Further, we may add, in many places in the Agenda, economic and trade concerns and policies are discussed, for example, in chapter 8. Similarly, when we turn to Agenda 30 we find that its 17 Sustainable Development Goals and 169 related targets again show that this Agenda is all-encompassing in scope. We should have no doubt that what is being introduced through Agendas 21 and 30 is a world-wide system encompassing all aspects of the environment and of society.

5.2. Agendas 21 and 30 Provide for Centralised Political Governance/Control by the UN. The centralised and global political role of the UN in the implementation and running of the new system prescribed by Agenda 21 is readily apparent from the document itself. Agenda 21 states that “The intergovernmental follow-up to the Conference process [i.e. implementation of Agenda 21] shall be within the framework of the United Nations system, with the *General Assembly* being *the supreme policy-making forum* that would provide *overall guidance* to Governments, the United Nations system and relevant treaty bodies.” (My italics) [Ch. 38, Sec. 1]. A little later it is stated that “The General Assembly, as the highest intergovernmental mechanism, is the *principal policy-making and appraisal organ* on matters relating to the follow-up of the Conference [i.e. on matters pertaining to Agenda 21].” [Ch. 38, Sec. 9]. In this task, the “The Economic and Social Council [of the UN]... would assist the General Assembly by *overseeing system-wide coordination* in the implementation of Agenda 21 and making recommendations in this regard. In addition, the Council would undertake the task of directing system-wide coordination and integration of

environmental and developmental aspects of United Nations policies and programmes and would make appropriate recommendations to the General Assembly, specialized agencies concerned and Member States.” (My italics and interpolation.) [Ch. 38, Sec. 10]. Further still, the General Assembly and Economic and Social Council will be assisted by a newly created Commission on Sustainable Development. It would function to “enhance international cooperation and rationalize the intergovernmental decision-making capacity for the integration of environment and development issues and to examine the progress in the implementation of Agenda 21 at the national, regional and international levels.... The Commission should provide for the active involvement of organs, programmes and organizations of the United Nations system, international financial institutions and other relevant intergovernmental organizations, and encourage the participation of non-governmental organizations, including industry and the business and scientific communities.” [Ch. 38, Sec. 11; Ch. Sec. 13 a-h]. More generally, Chapter 38 talks of the need for a “restructuring and revitalization” of the UN to fulfill its role in Agenda 21 [Ch. 38, Sec. 2]; the coordinated involvement of all UN agencies in Agenda 21 [Ch. 38, Sec. 4; Ch. 38, Sec. 8 b]; the need for coordinated UN involvement reaching down to all levels in all countries [Ch. 38, Sec. 8 a, d; Ch. 38, Sec. 20; Ch. 38, Sec. 41-2], and in this regard, extensive attention is given to the roles of the UN Environmental Programme [Ch. 38, Sec. 21-2] and the UN Development Programme [Ch. 38, Sec. 24-5]. In 2013 the Commission on Sustainable Development was replaced by the United Nations High Level Political Forum on Sustainable Development. This is now the main United Nations platform on Sustainable Development. [15]. The final section of Agenda 30, entitled Global Level shows this Forum has basically the same function as its predecessor. Section 82 states, “The *high level political forum will have central role in overseeing a network of follow-up and review processes at the global level*, working coherently with the General Assembly, the Economic and Social Council and other relevant organs and forums in accordance with existing mandates. It will facilitate sharing of experiences...and *provide political leadership, guidance and recommendations* for follow-up. It will promote system-wide coherence and coordination of sustainable development policies.” (My italics) On the UN website, sustainabledevelopment.un.org, the functions of the Forum are described. Among other functions it will provide “*political leadership, guidance and recommendations* for sustainable development;”, “enhance the integration of the three dimensions of sustainable development in a holistic and cross-sectoral manner *at all levels*.”, “follow up and review progress in the implementation of sustainable development commitments contained in Agenda 21 [and Agenda 30]..”, and “promote system-wide coherence and coordination of sustainable development policies.” (My italics and interpolation.) [15]. We should have no doubt that what is being introduced through these Agendas is a world-wide system of centralised government with the UN at its core.

It may be objected that Agendas 21 and 30 do not wish to override national government and sovereignty but to work within the limitations of national sovereignty. In this regard, section 38 of Agenda 30 might be adduced. It states, “We reaffirm, in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, the need to respect the territorial integrity and political independence of States.” However, later in the Agenda a caveat is introduced. In part, section 63 states, “We will respect each country’s policy space and leadership to implement policies for poverty eradication and sustainable development, while remaining consistent with relevant international rules and commitments.” So, international rules, for example laws, and commitments, which we may add will be primarily developed by the UN, trump national law and thus national sovereignty. Let’s consider some more examples.

Section 30 of the Agenda states that “States are strongly urged to refrain from promulgating and applying any unilateral economic, financial or trade measures not in accordance with international law and the Charter of the United Nations that impede the full achievement of economic and social development, particularly in developing countries.” Of course, “full achievement of economic and social development” means full achievement of *sustainable* development as described in the Agenda. So, when unilateral economic, financial and trade measures of a country conflict with sustainable development, and where these are in conflict with international law—formed primarily by the UN—or the UN Charter, then these measures are not to be instituted, and the sovereignty of a country is indeed overridden.

Another example of where national sovereignty must give way to international law vested in the UN is that of human rights. Section 19 of Agenda 30 states: “We reaffirm the importance of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, as well as other international instruments relating to human rights and international law. We emphasize the responsibilities of all States, in conformity with the Charter of the United Nations, to respect, protect and promote human rights and fundamental freedoms for all, without distinction of any kind as to race, colour, sex, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, property, birth, disability or other status.” Further, within Article 29(3) of the UN Declaration of Human Rights it states “These rights and freedoms may in no case be exercised *contrary to the purposes and principles of the United Nations.*” (My italics.) As Graham Williamson observes, “In other words, the UN has already removed any [exercise of] rights [and freedoms] of Australians (i.e. signatory countries) which they perceive to be at odds with the “purposes and principles” of the UN.” (My interpolations.) [29]. Australia or any other country only has rights and freedoms if they do not conflict with the purposes and principles of the UN—the UN reigns supreme. And who will adjudicate on conflicts between international and national laws? The International Court of Justice, *which is part of the UN.* [64 p. 9]. We must note also, that article six of the US Constitution states that all international treaties made under the authority of the US shall be the supreme law of the land overriding any State laws and the anything in the Constitution. [34 p. 63].

Further, as international laws, treaties and agreements, primarily developed by the UN, increase in number and scope, national sovereignty will continue to diminish. Indeed this body of international law is ever-increasing. For example, in 2005 the *legally* binding Kyoto Protocol which commits nations to reduce greenhouse gas was signed off by 192 countries. And in 2015 the Paris Climate Agreement was a non-legally binding pledge which commits countries to set greenhouse gas emission targets, and to regularly report on their progress. It has been signed off by 186 countries. Of course, such global warming agreements, which are in effect setting what are regarded as environmentally sustainable emissions targets, are intimately related to Agendas 21 and 30.

There is one further and very important dimension to appreciate regarding the issue of compliance with international obligations. While Agendas 21 and 30 are not legally binding treaties, they are pledges by nations to behave in certain ways. This means that they carry morally binding force. Now, while it is patently true that national governments are often not particularly moral, they are very concerned about being perceived to be moral. Therefore, non-legally binding pledges such as Agendas 21 and 30 do indeed carry a kind of moral force compelling their implementation, even if that defies national law and sovereignty.

Lest there be any doubt that nations will have to surrender their sovereignty, that is their power and freedom, and this is what is meant by Agenda 21 and will be a consequence of it, here are the words of Maurice Strong. Strong was appointed the first executive director of the United Nations Environmental Program, and was the Secretary General of, and led, the UN Conference on Environment and Development held in Rio de Janeiro in 1992 which produced Agenda 21. [60]. He stated, “The concept of national sovereignty has been an immutable, indeed sacred, principle of international relations. It is a principle which will yield only slowly and reluctantly to the new imperatives of global environmental cooperation. *It is simply not feasible for sovereignty to be exercised unilaterally by individual nation states, however powerful.* The global community must be assured of environmental security.” [23]. Strong was also a key architect of the 1997-2005 Kyoto Protocol that declared manmade global warming, according to a consensus, was real and predominantly caused by manmade carbon emissions. In 1988 he was also key in the creation of the UN’s International Panel on Climate Change, and later the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change. [61]. Here is someone deeply involved in UN environmental matters—‘obviously’ a deeply caring person. Strong was a billionaire Canadian oil man and a good friend of US billionaire oil man David Rockefeller. We may well ask ourselves ‘What is a billionaire oil man, involved in one of the most environmentally polluting and unjust industries in human history, doing leading the worlds foremost summit on ecological protection and sustainability and social justice?’ Of course, Agenda 21, which issued from the UN Conference on Environment and Development in 1992 and chaired by Strong, is not actually addressing these concerns; the Conference and Agenda were really about how Strong and his ilk like the Rockefellers could further increase their control of the world’s resources. Strong was involved in a series of scandals over the years and

the last one, the Oil-For-Food scandal in 2005 saw him flee to China. [60; 7 pp. 619-20]. We shall come back to Strong at various points in the paper.

In sum, we should have no doubt that what is being introduced through Agendas 21 and 30 is a world-wide system of centralised government with the UN at its core, and that this political control will be enforced through obligation to an increasing number of international laws and pledges primarily formulated by the UN, and where these laws and pledges do not respect national law or sovereignty.

The authors of Agendas 21 and 30 recognise that for their agenda to be implemented the necessary legislation will need to be enacted at the national and sub-national levels. Thus, section 45 of Agenda 30 states “We acknowledge also the essential role of national parliaments through their enactment of legislation and adoption of budgets and their role in ensuring accountability for the effective implementation of our commitments.” Similarly, Agenda 21 states, “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.” (My italics.) [Ch. 8, Sec. 15]. Of course, Agenda 21 is one such international agreement. Previously, in the brief history given of Agendas 21 and 30 (sections 2.1 and 2.2 of this paper) we saw how legislation to implement these Agendas has been enacted by the Australian and US governments. As the paper progresses we shall see more specific examples of such legislation.

Agenda 21 explicitly recognises the importance and need for it to be implemented at the *local* level—indeed the whole of Chapter 28 is devoted to describing this task. One way in which the implementation of Agenda 21 legislation, particularly at the local level, is recommended to be done is through the use of non-government organisations (NGOs): “Competent intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations could cooperate to provide Governments and legislators, upon request, with *an integrated programme of environment and development law (sustainable development law) services*, carefully adapted to the specific requirements of the recipient legal and administrative systems.” (My italics.) [Ch. 8, Sec. 19]. Indeed, this is precisely what is being done. In section 2.2 of this paper we have already come across one such example. This was in the US where the federal government provided funds to the American Planning Association to develop model legislation for the States to implement Agenda 21. The outcome was the document entitled *Growing Smart Legislative Guidebook: Model Statutes for Planning and the Management of Change*. Typically, this legislation, when adopted, requires the creation of a state-wide comprehensive land use plan that defines the administrative mechanisms for regional government agencies, and provides planning models for counties to use in creating county-wide land use plans. Further, using the coercive power of the federal budget, which the President’s Council for Sustainable Development describes as using financial incentives and disincentives, the federal government has had little trouble getting States to rush to adopt some form of this model legislation. [14].

Another example of the rollout of Agenda 21 legislation at the local level is the work of ICLEI. ICLEI, now also called Local Governments for Sustainability, is an NGO (centrally located in Bonn, Germany) which has and is playing a *central* role in the rollout of Agenda 21 around the world by working with local government and councils. Indeed, ICLEI is mentioned in Agenda 21 as an example of an NGO that cities and countries can use to foster their cooperative efforts. [Ch. 27, Sec. 21]. In their document *Preparing for Tomorrow 2010 – 2015 Strategy* ICLEI boasts that “ICLEI has achieved results that the planet notices. Over the last 20 years: We have built a global sustainability network of 1,200 local governments of all sizes in 70 countries. We have instigated a movement of about 10,000 local governments that have engaged their citizens in Local Agenda 21...” As ICLEI reported on their website in 2019, this number has now increased to more than 1,750 local and regional governments active in 100 plus countries. [10]. Maurice Strong—who, as discussed, was the leader of the 1992 Conference which produced Agenda 21—states in the *Local Agenda 21 Planning Guide* that “The task of mobilizing and technically supporting Local Agenda 21 planning in these communities has been led by the International Council for Local Environmental Initiatives (ICLEI) & national associations of local government.” Rosa Koire, an Agenda 21 expert and opponent, notes that among the forms of assistance ICLEI provides is “a library of local government *sample*

ordinances, policies, resolutions and other documents.” (My italics.) [2 p. 38]. (The role of ICLEI in rolling out Agenda 21 is discussed in more detail below.)

Quite clearly the UN is rolling out a seamless and relatively uniform legal system from the UN right through to local governments to thereby implement and enforce Agenda 21. Indeed this is explicitly stated by the UN in their *Review of Implementation of Agenda 21 and the Rio Principles* (Draft – Jan 2012): “All governance levels from local through global need to be vertically interconnected for bottom-up energy to meet top-down support.... 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.” [31]. In section 2.1 of this paper we have already seen that successive Australian governments have been willing participants in this legal rollout. In particular, the *Report On the Implementation of the Sustainable Development Goals 2018* compiled by Australia’s Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade proudly declares that “There is a large body of legislation, regulation and policy at national and sub-national level that drives us towards many of the outcomes enshrined in the SDGs [Sustainable Development Goals]. This is an ongoing and dynamic process.” [21 p. 13]. And earlier in 2012 the Gillard government proudly stated that “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.” [13].

6. Circumventing Democratically Elected Government Through the Pernicious Role of NGOs

We have seen: how the UN is using international legal agreements in an attempt to override national law and sovereignty to, on the one hand, progressively establish itself as a global centralised government, and on the other, implement Agendas 21 and 30; something of how national legislation is being enacted to rollout Agendas 21 and 30; and touched on how Agendas 21 and 30 are being rolled out at the local level through the involvement of NGOs like ICLEI. Let us take some time to more fully explore the latter process.

As stated, Agenda 21 devotes Chapter 28 to describing how its implementation can occur at the local level. In particular, it states “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;” [Ch. 28 Sec. 28.2 a]. In the Australian context, much of this local implementation was guided and facilitated by the NGO *Environs Australia: the Local Government Environment Network*. *Environs Australia* described itself as “a peak national organisation assisting local governments to move towards sustainability...[it] provides information, advice, international networking facilities, seminars, publications and consultancies on innovative approaches to environmental management.” (My interpolation.) [11]. In 1999 *Environs Australia* published an extensive document entitled *Our Community Our Future: A Guide to Local Agenda 21* which served as a detailed guide for councils to implement Agenda 21. It was supported and endorsed by the Commonwealth/Federal government, and in accord with Australia’s *National Strategy for Ecologically Sustainable Development* (introduced in 1992). [11 p. 5, 12]. This document by *Environs Australia* reveals the fundamental influence that Agenda 21 is meant to have at the local level. It states that “Local Agenda 21 provides the context for *all* council operations. It is not a discrete program which sits alongside strategies for waste management, parks and gardens and community services. Rather, the vision of sustainability and the goals and targets of Local Agenda 21 should set the direction for *all* council activities....it is an *umbrella* program, a strategic framework for directing action towards sustainable development. In contrast to the corporate plan with its three year horizon, the Local Agenda 21 has a much *longer* time frame.” (My italics.) [11 p. 14]. Throughout, the document emphasizes the need for involving a wide range of stakeholders including government and non-government organisations, state agencies, regional organisations, catchment groups, environment organisations, landcare groups, industry, businesses, trade unions and community groups. It presents three models for these groups to work with council, but quite clearly the one it puts first on its list and favours is “Community essentially driving Agenda 21 program with resources from council.” [11 p. 26]. Further, the need for a steering committee representing all major stakeholders is emphasized. A

powerful role for this non-governmental group is quite clearly favoured. [11 pp. 29-30]. Almost every council now employs a “sustainability officer” to implement Agenda 21 objectives at a local level. [19].

The Australian Local Government Association is another body pushing Agenda 21 policies. [19]. In 2002 the Australian Local Government Association reaffirmed their commitment to Agenda 21 in the *Sustaining Our Communities Declaration*: “There remains a pressing need for further action at all levels to be accelerated if the global sustainable development objectives of Agenda 21 are to be realised.... It is time to move from commitment to action... Continuing the implementation of Agenda 21 in our Local Governments and their communities... Continuing the implementation of Agenda 21 by establishing partnerships with non-government organisations, business and finance, and education and research institutions... Continuing the implementation of Agenda 21 by working as a partner with national, state and territory governments.” [31].

ICLEI, now also called Local Governments for Sustainability, has been briefly discussed at several points in this paper. This is an opportune time to elaborate upon this international NGO. The use of NGOs to implement Agenda 21 is expressly stated and supported in the document. Chapter 27 is entitled *Strengthening the Role of Non-Governmental Organizations: Partners for Sustainable Development*. Section 5 states, “Governments and international bodies should promote and allow the participation of nongovernmental organizations in the conception, establishment and evaluation of official mechanisms and formal procedures designed to review the implementation of Agenda 21 at all levels.” [Ch. 27, Sec. 8]. ICLEI is one of three NGOs named in Agenda 21 to facilitate its rollout. The other two are the International Union of Local Authorities (IULA), and the World Federation of Twin Cities. [Ch. 27, Sec. 21]. As noted previously, according to our old friend Maurice Strong in the *Local Agenda 21 Planning Guide*, “The task of mobilizing and technically supporting Local Agenda 21 planning in these communities has been led by the International Council for Local Environmental Initiatives (ICLEI) & national associations of local government.” [31]. Examples of ICLEI’s initiatives include *Cities for Climate Protection Campaign*, *Local Agenda 21 Initiative*, *Eco-Procurement Initiative*, *Action for Biodiversity*, *ecoBudget*, and *Triple Bottom Line*. [31]. The *principle* role of ICLEI and related NGOs is to serve as a connecting link between local government/local agencies and the UN—to feed them information and direction from the UN and to ‘represent’ them at the UN. [33]. In its document *Preparing for Tomorrow 2010 – 2015 Strategy* ICLEI states that it will: “will continue connecting cities and local governments to the United Nations and other international bodies” and “serve as a global entry point for cities and local governments to engage with the United Nations and international and national policy processes” and will “pursue more radical solutions.” [31]. On its own website ICLEI states that “it forms strategic alliances with international organizations, national governments, academic and financial institutions, civil society and the private sector...[to] lead our partners to build new ways to support sustainable development at the urban scale.” [10]. In this role it provides education, software, guidebooks, training, and *a library of government sample ordinances, policies, resolutions and documents*. [1]. All of this is in accord with the aim expressed in Agenda 21: “Intensive, short, practical training programmes with emphasis on skills in effective communication, community organization and *facilitation of behaviour change* should be developed in order to prepare the local personnel of all sectors involved in social development for carrying out their respective roles.”, their roles, that is, in implementing Agenda 21. (My italics). [Ch. 6, Sec. 8]. ICLEI also gets money for councils and will “Advocate direct access to climate finance and other funds by local governments and an inversion of climate finance mechanisms to enable the implementation of needs-driven local development.” [32]. Rosa Koire states that when working with a council ICLEI will help it to develop five milestones: Milestone One: Conduct a Climate Resiliency Study (which will basically show the need for urgent climate and environmental action, e.g. too many CO2 emissions); Milestone Two: Set Preparedness Goals; Milestone Three: Develop a Climate Preparedness Plan (which will basically state the many ways in which a local area needs to be developed or redeveloped in order to align with the resiliency or sustainability goals i.e. Agenda 21); Milestone Four: Publish and Implement Plan (to guide the General Plan of the council for its area, including penalties for failures to comply with the plan.) Milestone Five: Monitor and Re-evaluate Resiliency. [1].

Make no mistake, ICLEI and related NGOs have a *mandate* and *mission*: to rollout Agenda 21 uniformly throughout the world. These NGOs exist to get local governments to implement Agenda 21; they do *not* exist to assist local government councils in a more general manner in accord with the latter's own chosen directions. To implement Agendas 21 and 30 at the local level, NGOs such as ICLEI have, in particular, employed two strategies which are designed to circumvent or override democratically elected and accountable government, especially at the local level: regionalisation; and "consensus" or "participatory decision making." These two strategies are part of what Agenda 21 means when it states that the "The overall objective is to *improve or restructure the decision-making process* so that consideration of socio-economic and environmental issues is fully integrated and a broader range of public participation assured." (My italics.) [Ch. 8, Sec. 3]. Regionalisation is basically where *new, non-elected* decision-making bodies, boards, groups or committees are formed to plan, develop, steer, advocate for, direct and enforce the implementation of Agenda 21 policies and programs for *new regional* areas, that is, areas which cover a number of formally recognised areas (and boundaries) such as local councils, towns and cities. The decisions of these regional bodies affect the whole, newly created region, and in doing so ignore, circumvent or even override democratically elected local council members. The ostensible reason given for creating and empowering these regional decision-making bodies is explained in Agenda 21: "Some metropolitan areas extend over the boundaries of several political and/or administrative entities (counties and municipalities) even though they conform to a continuous urban system. In many cases this political heterogeneity hinders the implementation of comprehensive environmental management programmes." (My italics.) [Ch. 7, Sec. 14]. Thus, there will be the "Adopting [of] integrated approaches to sustainable development at the regional level, including transboundary areas." (My interpolation.) [Ch. 8, Sec. 5-e]; and where this will in done in part by "Encouraging regional seminars and, possibly, the development of regional centres of expertise [e.g. regional decision-making groups]." (My interpolation.) [Ch. 8, Sec. 34-b]. Regionalisation will occur at *all* levels. Chapter 38 Section 1, entitled "Regional and subregional cooperation and implementation" stresses the importance of regional cooperation particularly at the international level. The nature of regionalisation is nicely summed up in the article *A Critical Analysis of Agenda 21—United Nations Program of Action*: "One way the Agenda plans on overriding, or limiting, the sovereignty of local democratic government, is to blur, or even erase, the existing boundaries that separate cities, municipalities, states, countries, etc., and create new, or strengthen existing, regional boundaries. These regions will have their own regional government, whose power will supersede that of your elected governments. And, of course, these regional governments are not, and *will not be, democratically elected.*" (My italics.) [3]. The author (unidentified) is using the term regional "government" here in a loose manner—although the formation of these regional bodies is generally initiated by government officials, these bodies are *not* governmental bodies composed of democratically elected government representatives.

The principle way in which these unelected regional groups, bodies, boards or committees circumvent democratically elected council members to implement their plans and decisions is through "consensus" or "participatory" decision making. Agenda 21 repeatedly describes and advocates for the use of this type of decision making. For example Chapter 37 Section 5 states, "As an important aspect of overall planning, each country should seek internal consensus at all levels of society on policies and programmes needed for short- and long-term capacity-building to implement its Agenda 21 programme. This consensus should result from a participatory dialogue of relevant interest groups..." Consensus or participatory decision making is, no doubt, part of "The overall objective...to *improve or restructure the decision-making process* so that consideration of socio-economic and environmental issues is fully integrated and a broader range of public participation assured." (My italics.) [Ch. 8, Sec. 3]. Basically, what occurs in consensus or participatory decision making is that many or all of those stakeholders which will be affected by new Agenda 21 or 30 policies, plans and processes—often of course given different names such as sustainable development—are involved, by the regional body, in contributing to the decision making process i.e. participation to reach a so-called consensus. Superficially, it sounds very egalitarian. However, it is actually a ruse, a deception. Key players who will in one way or another benefit from implementing the Agenda 21 policy in question, plan or process—some of whom will be members of the regional body—have *already decided* on the policy, plan or process and its implementation, and the so-called process of community participation is nothing more than

giving stakeholders the *impression* that are influential in making the decision; they are in fact secretly guided toward a chosen outcome. This is called the Delphi Technique. [2].

In her work the *Behind the Green Mask: U.N. Agenda 21*, Rosa Koire explains the Delphi Technique in some detail, and provides many examples of how it is being used to implement Agenda 21 at the local level in the US. Basically the Delphi Technique is to get a person or group of people to accept a pre-determined outcome imposed upon them while convincing them that it is their own idea. It uses various techniques including: so-called ‘facilitators’ to steer the group toward a desired outcome; using a tight schedule which limits time for questions and in-depth discussion; bringing into meetings a range of people who will support the desired option but omitting those people who will oppose it; encouraging comments and questions which support the desired outcome but discreetly ignoring or discarding those that do not; rescheduling meetings if the desired outcome cannot be achieved; giving stakeholders real choices on minor issues only; shaming those who voice disagreement with the desired outcome; using a proliferation of agencies, boards, meetings, and programs to make it impossible to keep up with events related to the desired outcome; infiltrating neighbourhood associations; and creating new community groups with selected members. [2; 1]. Indeed, Agenda 30 itself was a product of the Delphi Technique. As Patrick Wood points out, the Agenda was composed by the High-Level Panel of Eminent Persons on the Post-2015 Development Agenda, that is, a small group of 27 people selected by the UN, was later ‘ratified’ by another UN body, the High-Level Political Forum, and then presented for a vote by nations in 2015, *with no further changes allowed*—hardly a democratic process. [65 p. 34].

In various ways, ICLEI and related NGOs will facilitate the process of regionalisation and consensus decision making to get Agenda 21 policies implemented. For example, they be instrumental in forming a regional body or steering committee; they may provide this body with Agenda 21 model legislation; they may provide ‘facilitators’ trained in the Delphi Technique to get stakeholders involved in consensus decision making to agree to Agenda 21 policies, plans and processes; or they may select which stakeholders attend meetings. As stated, ICLEI and related NGOs have a mandate and mission to rollout Agendas 21 and 30. Thus, when ICLEI is involved in the process of regionalisation, and in consensus and participatory decision making, it will be working more or less covertly to implement Agenda 21 and, if required, circumvent and over-ride democratically elected and accountable council and government officials. Don’t believe me? Here is what councillor Jess Fields stated when the local government of College Station in Texas recently withdrew from Agenda 21: “I am truly excited to announce that the proposed 2013 College Station budget will *not* include funding for this organization (ICLEI—an Agenda 21 organisation)... It is an insidious, extreme institution that does not represent our citizens, and for our taxpayers to continue to fund it would be ridiculous... This organization is a threat to our individual rights and our local government’s sovereignty in decision-making... ICLEI’s Charter and its Strategic Plan both reinforce what could already be surmised by examining its founding and history.... This is an international organization with an extreme environmentalist bent, which desires to impose its vision of ‘sustainability’ on the citizens of member cities and connect to the United Nations in a way that furthers that goal... We do not need international organizations leading the way for us in how we develop our planning and development tools and regulations. It is better for policies to reflect the actual needs of our community than some amorphous concept of greenness or sustainability, promoted by an overarching international body.” [26].

In addition to regionalisation and consensus decision making, NGOs exert their authority to control democratically elected representative government in at least one other major way: funding. Two prime examples of NGO regional bodies in the US context are regional Councils of Government and, often associated with them, Metropolitan Planning Organisations. There are some 500 and 400 of these bodies respectively which blanket the US. These regional bodies have voluntary membership, hold no elections, have no regulatory authority, no power of taxation and no police powers, and yet they impose or assert authority over areas such as regional planning, land use, zoning, property rights, transport regulations and funding distribution for counties and cities. Why would anyone listen to these regional bodies if have voluntary membership and no legal authority? Because in the US they are the middlemen for much of the

Federal government's funding to the counties and cities—the government has given them the purse strings, or more harshly stated, the power to extort. [65 p .80-4, 96-7].

7. Agendas 21 and 30 Are Prescribing and Implementing a New Economic Order

Throughout chapter 4 of Agenda 21 it is made clear that the authors believe that our current system of production and consumption, and therefore, we may add, our current system of a capitalist free market which largely dictates patterns of production and consumption, is degrading the environment and resources and is not sustainable: “the major cause of the continued deterioration of the global environment is the unsustainable pattern of consumption and production, particularly in industrialized countries, which is a matter of grave concern, aggravating poverty and imbalances.” [Ch. 4, Sec. 3; 3]. To remedy this situation, the Agenda propose measures that, essentially, put a price upon the environment, that is, they impose costs on the production and consumption of goods for both producers and consumers so that resources and the environment are used in a sustainable and, in particular, a more frugal manner. As Agenda 21 states, it will “incorporate environmental costs in the decisions of producers and consumers, to reverse the tendency to treat the environment as a free good...” [Ch. 8, Sec. 31 a] and it will “move more fully towards integration of social and environmental costs into economic activities, so that prices will appropriately reflect the relative scarcity and total value of resources and contribute towards the prevention of environmental degradation;” [Ch. 8, Sec. 31 b]. What specific measures will be used to change patterns of production and consumption so that they are sustainable? Examples include: one, “the polluter-pays principle and the more recent natural-resource-user-pays concept.” [Ch 8, Sec. 28]; two, “environmental taxation” [e.g. Ch. 8, Sec. 36-a and 28]; three, environmental laws and regulations [Ch. 8, Secs. 13-16]; four, tariffs or increased prices [Ch. 18, Sec. 8; Ch. 7, Sec. 16 ci]; and five, “public-private partnerships [PPP] and blended financing, as envisaged by the Addis Agenda.” (My interpolation.) [21 p. 68], and again, “Governments, business and industry, including transnational corporations, should strengthen partnerships to implement the principles and criteria for sustainable development.” [Ch. 30, Sec. 7]. Not surprisingly, the *privately* owned World Bank and International Monetary Fund, closely associated with the UN but not actually and formally part of it, have also greatly pushed PPPs around the world. [65 p. 76].

On the other hand, Agenda 21 strongly and repeatedly declares that any regulations which are barriers to sustainable development at the *international* level must be removed. Thus, Agenda 30 states that “International trade is an engine for inclusive economic growth and poverty reduction and contributes to the promotion of sustainable development. We will continue to promote a universal rules-based, open and transparent, predictable, inclusive, non-discriminatory and equitable multilateral trading system under the World Trade Organisation, as well as meaningful trade liberalization.” [Section 68], and again, we pledge to “Correct and prevent trade restrictions and distortions in world agricultural markets including through the parallel elimination of all forms of agricultural export subsidies and all export measures with equivalent effect, in accordance with the mandate of the Doha Development Round.” [Section 2.5 b]. Similar recommendations are found in Agenda 21 especially in chapters 2, 4 and 8. [e.g. Ch. 2 Secs. 5, 7, 9 a, 10 a, and 12].

What are, or will be, the implications of implementing the above round of economic measures prescribed by Agendas 21 and 30 to curb unsustainable production, consumption and distribution and to promote instead sustainable development? The *basic* consequence of implementing these measures would be a complete transformation of the existing economic order. Thus, in 2105 Christiana Figueres, then Executive Secretary of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change—which originated from the same conference as Agenda 21—stated: “This is probably the most difficult task we have ever given ourselves, which is to intentionally transform the economic development model, for the first time in human history. This is the first time in the history of mankind that we are setting ourselves the task of intentionally, within a defined period of time to change the economic model that has been reigning for at least 150 years, since the industrial revolution... It is a process because of the depth of transformation.” [65 p. 25]. Typical of people behind and pushing Agenda 21, Figueres does *not* clearly tell us what this new economic order will look like. In this and the next section in particular I hope to make it abundantly clear what the new economic

order will look like: it will be the end of free market capitalism which relies in turn on private and individual property ownership, private and individual property rights, and individual rights in general—for all of this, according to Agendas 21 and 30 creates unsustainable development. Instead, the new economic order will be a fascist-totalitarian and seamless merger between mega-banks, corporations and government who, *supposedly* in the pursuit of ‘sustainability’, an ambiguous term which *they* will constantly define and redefine, will control all economic activity for *their* benefit.

7.1. Implication One: Higher Costs and A Restricted Lifestyle. As costs are imposed to curb unsustainable consumption and production patterns and promote their opposite, the costs of producing many goods and services will rise, and these costs will be passed onto consumers. The basic equation is that the more unsustainable it is to produce a good or service the more costly it will be. Second, many goods, services and activities, those which are more or less unsustainable, will be rationed, restricted or even banned; where the basic equation is that the more unsustainable a good, service or activity the more it will be rationed, restricted or banned. Overall we are looking at a more costly and restricted lifestyle. Which goods and services will be more costly and by how much, and which goods, services and activities will be rationed, restricted or banned and by how much will depend on to what degree they are or are not deemed sustainable. This brings us to two crucial questions: ‘How do we define sustainability?’ and, related, ‘*Who* defines sustainability and, in turn, what is and is not sustainable?’

Here, we come to a fundamental shortcoming and flaw in the new political, economic, ecological and social system that Agendas 21 and 30 are attempting to introduce: this system is designed to achieve sustainable development and yet it is impossible to give a clear and detailed definition of sustainability, particularly as it applies to concrete situations. Agenda 21 makes explicit that the goal is to establish sustainable development, “a global partnership for sustainable development.” [4; Ch. 1, Sec. 1.1.] The term “sustainable” is used extensively throughout the document, for example, “sustainable livelihood” [Ch. 3, Sec. 4-a], and “sustainable city networks” [Ch. 7, Sec. 20-d]. Likewise, in Agenda 30 the aim is to create a “sustainable framework” for countries across the planet by integrating the three dimensions of sustainable development—economic, social and environmental. But what is meant by the term “sustainable” is never really made clear or specifically defined. In some sense it means an “integration of environment and development concerns”, which will lead to “the fulfilment of basic needs, improved living standards for all, better protected and managed ecosystems and a safer, more prosperous future.” [Ch. 1, Sec. 1]. This sounds good, but very general. [3]. Perhaps the most commonly used definition of sustainability is that formulated in the 1987 Brundtland Commission report entitled *Our Common Future*. This report contributed in a major way to the UN Conference on Environment and Development held in Rio de Janeiro in 1992 from which Agenda 21 emerged. *Our Common Future* states that sustainable development is “Development that meets the needs of the current generation without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs.” [34 p. 87]. While nice-sounding this, again, is very general. To some extent this generality is to be expected, for regarding Agendas 21 and 30 and related documents we are looking at *general* policy statements or sets of guidelines. However, it points to a more fundamental problem: to reiterate, it is impossible to give clear and detailed definition of sustainability, particularly as it applies to concrete situations. The actual form which sustainability takes will need to be worked out in each individual situation and, related, what sustainability looks like will change along with changing conditions and circumstances.

However, for those who are using Agenda 21 as a benevolent guise to rollout a totalitarian-fascist and dystopian regime of centralised control of the world, the ambiguity around the concept of sustainability is not a short-coming or flaw of the Agenda but rather, crucial to its success. Because the term sustainability will need to be more or less re-defined in each new situation this means that any aspect of production, consumption and distribution, and more widely, any aspect of society, can be defined as sustainable or unsustainable, and therefore promoted, restricted or shaped in such a way which suits those who are seeking to control the resources, activities, people, environment and conditions of the world. In this way the notion of sustainability will be used to mould a dystopian world. Not convinced? Well, let us consider some of the things which have, so far, been regarded as unsustainable and therefore will not be found in our new ‘utopian’ Agenda 21 world. Let’s begin with our friend Maurice Strong, the UN member who headed the

1992 UN Conference on Environment and Development from which Agenda 21 emerged. He stated, “Developed and benefited from the unsustainable patterns of production and consumption which have produced our present dilemma. It is clear that current lifestyles and consumption patterns of the affluent middle class—involving high meat intake, consumption of large amounts of frozen and convenience foods, use of fossil fuels, appliances, home and work-place air-conditioning, and suburban housing—are not sustainable. A shift is necessary toward lifestyles less geared to environmentally damaging consumption patterns.” [18; 23]. That Maurice is a billionaire oil man i.e. a mega-fossil fuel producer, should make it clear that he does not *really* want to ban fossil fuels. More generally, when we have a billionaire oil man like Strong (or his mate David Rockefeller) who is purportedly a strong environmental advocate, we should be *deeply* suspicious of his motives and what he is really up to. And is Strong so stupid that he cannot see that some of the things which he says are not sustainable, such as air conditioning, would indeed be sustainable if energy was produced, as Agenda 21 recommends, through renewables? And what is wrong with frozen and convenience foods if the energy is renewable and the food produced sustainably? What Strong is *actually* doing is getting people use to the idea of a very restricted dystopian lifestyle. Similarly, here are some of the activities which have been designated as not sustainable in the UN’s *Global Biodiversity Assessment* (GBA) which grew out of the *Convention On Biological Diversity*, one of three legally binding documents that come out of the 1992 UN Conference on Environment and Development (that also produced Agenda 21): ski runs, grazing of livestock, ploughing of soil, building fences, industry, single family homes, paved and tarred roads, logging activities, dams and reservoirs, power line construction, and economic systems that fail to set proper value on the environment. [6]. In 2015 there were some 65,000 dams in the US and a massive 22,000 have been targeted for removal. [34 p. 95]. The above list should give anyone who loves civilisation as we know it pause for thought about the true nature of Agenda 21. Sustainability, in the context of Agenda 21, is really an excuse for imposing upon the world a dystopian future that people would reject if it was clearly presented. By the way, the GBA also states that the human population should be reduced to somewhere between one to three billion people. [34 p. 96]. I shall return to this topic.

There is a more general problem and warning here: in addition to the term sustainability, Agendas 21 and 30 have many other nice-sounding and key terms such as “smart growth”, and “consensus” and “participatory” decision making, “resiliency” and “visioning” which are left ill-defined and vague. Like the term and goal “sustainable” we have seen, and shall further see, that in practice these are ambiguous terms of deceit for the implementation of the dark agenda of Agendas 21 and 30.

7.2. Implication Two: Fascism. A second major implication of the above-mentioned measures contained in Agendas 21 and 30 to supposedly curb unsustainable production and consumption patterns and to promote their opposite, is the development of fascism, that is, collusion between corporations and government for *their* mutual benefit. In the opening paragraph of this section of the paper we have seen that both Agendas promote the formation of what are called Public Private Partnerships (PPP). This is where government and corporations develop partnerships to promote and implement sustainable development. What form do these take? Essentially PPPs are where the government partners with certain corporations to undertake developments or projects, such as infrastructure. Both parties contribute finances or what is called blended finance or finance blending. On the one hand, the government is enabled to undertake certain developments and projects, supposedly of a sustainable nature, on the other hand, the corporation gets certain concessions from the government such as eminent domain land, tax breaks, free tracts of land, waiver from regulations, special zoning considerations and, very importantly, ownership or certain rights over the completed development. Again, ICLEI has been intimately involved with facilitating PPPs. Tom DeWeese notes, “At the local and state levels one organization, Local Governments for Sustainability, previously named International Council for Local Environmental Initiatives (ICLEI), has been responsible for introducing Public Private Partnerships (PPP), special agreements between government and corporations that receive tax breaks, grants, and eminent domain through government’s power to implement sustainable policies.” [6]. (Eminent domain is where the government can, under certain conditions, acquire privately held land and property, for example, for infrastructure projects in the public interest.) As another critic of Agenda 21, Rosa Koire, notes, “Public/private partnerships favor some businesses over others and completely unbalance the playing field.” [2 p. 19]. Restated, no longer do businesses compete equally in a free market, but now some

will be favoured and supported by government. The government decides what is sustainable, and it assists businesses or corporations which it believes, rightly or wrongly, will help fulfill this vision of sustainability. In the new world of Agenda 21 it is not the demand for goods and services in the free market which determines which economic development takes place but which development the government deems sustainable; in short, the economic development of society is now largely in government hands. And as we have seen, Agendas 21 and 30 are instituting a centralised governmental network, supported by legislation, that runs all the way back and up to the UN. PPPs are clearly wide-open to abuse and corruption, where the simple and evil formula is that corrupt politicians and government officials unfairly give money and concessions to certain corporations and these corporations, in turn, illegally or legally give money and other forms of support back to politicians and government officials—for their, not the population's, benefit. This type of corruption is already rife in most countries around the world and getting worse; but PPPs will only serve to hasten this degeneration as politicians and other public officials now have the ready-made excuse that a grant or concession to a business was made on the basis that this company could best fulfill a sustainable development goal, *where what is sustainable development in each situation has been determined by the government!*

7.3. Implication Three: The Accelerated Growth of Transnational Corporations and Banks. While within a country Agendas 21 and 30 are clearly opposed to free trade, where everything will be *highly* regulated and controlled by government, by contrast, these Agendas strongly and repeatedly support completely unregulated or liberalised international trade. Chapters 2, 4 and 8 of Agenda 21 make this especially clear. The justification given is that international free trade promotes prosperity for all, and that prosperity in turn promotes sustainability. However, the last 40 or so years of Neo-liberalism, which has vigorously facilitated international deregulation or liberalisation of trade and commerce, has *not* resulted in prosperity for all. Instead, wealth has been progressively concentrated in the hands of fewer and fewer people. Deregulation or liberalisation has enabled transnational corporations and the banks behind them to expand enormously and expand their wealth enormously. 51 of the biggest 100 economies now are not countries, but transnational corporations. It was estimated that in 2015 the 2000 largest transnational companies generated 39 trillion in revenues, profits of 3 trillion, and possessed 16 trillion in assets. It was estimated that in 2015 the richest 0.07% of the world's population had approximately 2.5 times more wealth (100 trillion) than the poorest 90% of the population (40 trillion). [36]. Transnationals breed gross inequality of wealth and therefore injustice. Further, these transnationals inevitably grow to establish monopolies and oligopolies which further concentrate their wealth and ownership. By 2012 five or six multi-national companies—NewsCorp, Disney, Viacom, Time-Warner, CBS and NBC—controlled approximately 90% of US telecommunications and print media. Today, just five companies—Syngenta, ChinaChem, Dow, Dupont and Bayer—control most of the world's seeds. Again, just six companies control 80-90% of the world's grain supply. Again, in 2011 a study by the Swiss Federal Institute of Technology found that just 1,318 transnational companies owned the majority of the world's large blue-chip manufacturing firms; with 147 corporations controlling 40% of the wealth in this network—mainly financial activities. [36]. Further still, these transnational companies pillage and plunder the planet in ways which are neither kind to the environment nor to people, and which are definitely not sustainable. For example, transnational gas and oil companies have developed massive coal-seam gas or fracking operations throughout the US, Australia (which has some 43,000 fracking wells) and other countries, where this process poisons the environment, including underground water supplies, with toxic fracking chemicals. Another example: the genetically modified foods produced by Monsanto, and now Bayer Crop Science, have been conclusively found through *independent* and world class research to be extremely bad for human health. And yet Monsanto at least has a long history of covering up this evidence. [39 esp. Ch. 10]. Further still, as they pillage the planet these transnational companies use international laws and arrangements to pay little or no taxation—they take and do not give, except at a price—hardly just. For example, Exxon, Chevron, Mobil, Shell, Santos and Energy Australia paid no tax in Australia in 2017-8. Some of these companies have paid no tax in Australia for years, for example, Exxon has paid no tax in Australia on \$42.3 billion in revenue in five years. [37; 38].

Even worse than these corporations are the massive private banks which sit behind them. Since the Global Financial Crisis, world debt has increased by some 70% to around \$243 trillion. Ultimately, this world debt

is owed to private banks. The current banking system is inherently morally degenerate and unjust. Private banks make money out of thin air by using a practice called fractional reserve lending. This is where banks can lend money (issue credit) up to ten times (or more) over what they actually possess. This is to say that banks loan ‘money’ they do not possess. Not only do the Banksters charge interest on this phantom money, but they also steal someone’s or a company’s or a country’s assets when debts cannot be repaid. Bankers are parasites sucking off the wealth of the world and sending it ever deeper into impoverishment.

If the people behind Agendas 21 and 30 were serious about reducing world inequality, poverty, injustice and unsustainability, they would *begin* with policies that addressed the existence, nature and criminally and morally corrupt practices of transnational corporations and the mega-private banks behind them. But they do not. Instead, through advocating for complete unregulated or liberalised international free trade, which implies the same for finance, they strongly support the continued growth of transnational corporations and banks and the inequality, injustice and unattainability inherent to them. The stance of Agendas 21 and 30 toward completely unregulated or liberalised international trade and finance clearly shows who is behind these Agendas: their ultimate authors are the people who own the mega-corporations and mega-banks. Included among these massive private banks are the World Bank and International Monetary Fund—both of which are closely associated with the UN and often mistaken as part of the UN—the International Bank of Settlements, and the central banks of each country, including the Federal Reserve in the US, which are privately, not publicly, owned. Agenda 21 is not about establishing economically and ecologically sustainable and socially just communities throughout the world; it is about giving complete control of the world to the people who own the mega-banks and transnational corporations and to a lesser extent their lackeys and sycophants. Maurice Strong is one such person; another is his former mate David Rockefeller, and another is his mate and fellow Bankster Jacob Rothschild whose family has an estimated fortune of up to one trillion dollars. Other banksters include the following families and dynasties: Morgans, Schiffs, Goldmans, Sachs, Warburgs, Windsors, Krupps, Astors, and De Medici.

8. Agendas 21 and 30 are Being Implemented to Bring About the Abolition of Private Property Ownership and Individual Rights

Agendas 21 and 30 prescribe governmental control of land, resources and human activities as necessary to attain sustainable development. This imperative creates a fundamental conflict: on the one hand, we have the need for vastly increased governmental control over land, resources and activities for the end of sustainability, while on the other hand, we have the individual and *private* ownership of land with attendant property rights, and more generally individual rights, which will provide the freedom to determine what is done with land and resources and what activities are undertaken. Indeed, when people have private ownership of property along with property rights and, more generally, have individual rights, they will often act in ways which are deemed not to be sustainable or just by governments. As Henry Lamb, a severe critic of Agenda 21, stated, “Sustainable communities cannot emerge as the natural outgrowth of free people making individual choices in a free market economy.” If Agendas 21 and 30 are to succeed then individual and private land ownership, property rights and, more generally, individual rights will have to go. The true nature of the UN’s attitude toward private property ownership is revealed in the *Report of Habitat: UN Conference on Human Settlements, 1976*. This and the two subsequent Habitat Conferences in 1996 and 2016 have helped to inform and support Agendas 21 and 30. In the Report the vision for sustainable usage of land is delineated: “Land...cannot be treated as an ordinary asset, controlled by individuals and subject to the pressures and inefficiencies of the market. Private land ownership is also a principal instrument of accumulation and concentration of wealth and therefore contributes to social injustice; if unchecked, it may become a major obstacle in the planning and implementation of development schemes.” Further, it states: “The provision of decent dwellings and healthy conditions for the people can *only* be achieved if land is used in the interests of society as a whole. *Public control of land use is therefore indispensable....*” (My italics.) [19]. It is important to note, that while this section of this paper focuses on property as land, Agenda 21 will seek to remove individual ownership, and related rights, of *any type* of property whose use is not regarded by the government as sustainable, for example, cars and suburban housing.

There are a number of principles and strategies which have been, and are being, used to take away individual and private property and property rights and transfer these to government and big corporations. One strategy is to impose extensive biodiversity or environmental restrictions on *rural* land which also serve to make it less useful and thus valuable. Here in Australia, and in other countries, there is an ever-increasing body of environmental laws which effectively remove or place restrictions on the rights of owners of rural land supposedly to ensure the biodiversity and sustainability on that land. Indeed, in the name of sustainability these laws often place duties upon the owners which, if violated, incur penalties. Examples of such legislation in Australia are the *NSW Vegetation Act*, the *NSW Threatened Species Conservation Act* and the *Biodiversity and Conservation Act 2016*. The latter prescribes the Biodiversity Offsets Scheme (replacing the biobanking scheme) and Biodiversity Certification scheme which basically give the land owner some degree of credit or compensation for selling certain rights to, or undertaking certain duties upon, his/her land. The rights go to government ownership which the government can then use or resell to developers at a price. Formerly some of this was under the *NSW Threatened Species and Conservation Act*. [26; 32]. The increasing number of environmental laws emphasising sustainability and biodiversity, and which are no doubt Agenda 21 and 30 ‘inspired’, increasingly restrict rural landowners while placing few or no restrictions on the biggest environmental vandals of all, the oil and gas industries. For example, in sections 127U and 127S of the *NSW Threatened Species Conservation Act* it is explicitly stated that nothing in the division of it relating to *biobanking* “prevents the grant of a mining authority or petroleum title in respect of a biobank site in accordance with the Mining Act 1992 or the Petroleum (Onshore) Act 1991.” [26]. You see, Agendas 21 and 30 are not really about protecting the environment or sustainability, but about progressively taking away the property and rights of individuals and giving increased rights and control to government and big business. For precisely the same reason we find the following piece of rank hypocrisy. The *Report on the Implementation of the Sustainable Development Goals 2018* is the Commonwealth/Federal government’s report on how ‘well’ it is doing in the implementation of the Sustainable Development Goals of Agenda 30. With regard to Sustainable Development Goal 7, Ensure Access to Affordable Reliable Sustainable and Modern Energy for All, it is stated: “To contribute to meeting our emissions reduction target under the Paris Agreement, Australia is committed to reducing emissions and to increasing its share of renewable energy to around 23 per cent of Australia’s electricity by 2020. Some states and territories have also set their own additional renewable energy targets.” Whether Australia has met this target is open to debate, but certainly what it has done is to have *tripled* its exports of gas (a fossil fuel) since 2014 (not to mention its increasing coal exports). [37; 38]. We see that the Australian government is not really serious about sustainable development, but it is serious about the growth of big business.

We also see restrictions on *urban* land use which effectively remove the ownership of private property, property rights, and individual rights in general. In section 2.2 of this paper we saw how the States in the US were pressured into designing new state-wide comprehensive land use plans which were in turn imposed on counties within States. These comprehensive land use plans were fundamentally similar for they were based on model legislation contained in the document entitled *Growing Smart Legislative Guidebook: Model Statutes for Planning and the Management of Change* which adapted Agenda 21 principles to the US situation. These comprehensive plans were also fundamentally similar because their formulation was primarily ‘facilitated’ i.e. directed, by ICLEI—the primary NGO for rolling out Agenda 21 worldwide at the local level—and other such NGOs. These comprehensive land use plans impose a number of laws and regulations which remove private property ownership and property rights and give them to the government. These include re-zoning to limit development (growth) to certain areas within the county to prevent development in environmentally sensitive areas but which are often quite arbitrary and reflect political considerations. Land excluded from development plummets in value which can then be bought cheaply and developed when restrictions are changed. Other regulations and laws restrict motor vehicle use either directly or indirectly. (Agenda 21 explicitly supports restricting car use and favouring other more sustainable modes of transport. [e.g. Ch 7, Secs. 54 b, 52].) Progressively, multiple housing units and other high-density options are being preferred over single-family structures. (We may recall Maurice Strong’s words that suburban homes are not sustainable.) Eminent domain is another tool used by local governments to bring their communities into compliance with the new sustainable visions of local or State governments. With increasing frequency governments have used this technique to take land, but not for public use as required

by the U.S. Constitution, but for whatever the government deems to be a ‘public benefit.’ Other laws may condemn and seize the private property of an individual because it does not comply with requirements of the new sustainable vision/comprehensive plan which may be extremely detailed and onerous to comply with. Also, greatly increased insurance premiums based on real or manufactured risk assessments will be used to force people from some areas. What unites these laws and regulations implemented under the banner of sustainability is the progressive reduction of private ownership of land, of rights related to private property, and of individual rights in general. For those who are interested in many real life examples and personal accounts of how Agenda 21 is being introduced and used in the US to take away private property and individual rights, Rosa Koire’s book *Behind the Green Mask: UN Agenda 21* and Ron Taylor’s short book *Agenda 21: An Expose of the United Nation’s Sustainable Development Initiative and the Forfeiture of American Sovereignty and Liberties* are recommended.

As mentioned earlier, due to their fundamentally undemocratic nature and the threat they pose to basic human rights, the laws and regulations prosecuting Agenda 21 are now being progressively opposed in the US. So far resolutions opposing this Agenda have been proposed or passed in the states of Wyoming, Montana, Minnesota, Washington, Oklahoma, Iowa, Texas, South Dakota, Wisconsin and Arkansas. [31]. For example, Senate bill 477 banning Agenda 21 was passed by the legislature in Alabama. In part it states: “Section 1. (b) The State of Alabama and all political subdivisions may not adopt or implement policy recommendations that deliberately or inadvertently infringe or restrict private property rights without due process, as may be required by policy recommendations originating in, or traceable to ‘Agenda 21’, adopted by the United Nations in 1992 at its Conference on Environment and Development or any other international law or ancillary plan of action that contravenes the Constitution of the United States or the Constitution of the State of Alabama.... (c) Since the United Nations has accredited and enlisted numerous non-governmental and inter-governmental organizations to assist in the implementation of its policies relative to Agenda 21 around the world, the State of Alabama and all political subdivisions may not enter into any agreement, expend any sum of money, or receive funds contracting services, or giving financial aid to or from those non-governmental and inter-governmental organizations as defined in Agenda 21.”

9. Communitarianism and the Demise of Individual Rights

I have discussed the demise of individual and private property ownership and related rights, and individual rights in general, including their progressive transfer into government and corporate hands under Agendas 21 and 30, and will do so more shortly with regard to issues such as water rights, data and privacy. At this juncture it will be informative to understand the ideological and false foundation which underlies this demise and transfer. Agendas 21 and 30 *implicitly* embody the ideological principle—I won’t dignify it with the name philosophy—called Communitarianism. Communitarianism is where there is a ‘balancing’ of individual rights against those of the community. [2 pp. 7-10]. Agendas 21 and 30 do not appear to specifically discuss rights. With regard to decisions on sustainable development Agenda 21 repeatedly states that the views of all “stakeholders” should be “balanced” through a process of “participation” leading to “consensus.” The rights of groups and individuals cannot be ignored in this process if only because in other documents the UN, such as the *UN Declaration of Human Rights*, explicitly describes and supports human rights. So, the rights of stakeholders, that is, individuals, groups, organisations and communities, are considered in the decision making process. However, there are serious problems with Communitarianism. Firstly, *who* defines the rights of a *community* or group in regard to sustainability? Agenda 21 does not provide them. Any group can put up its hand and say ‘I have a right to this or that.’ But does it? What makes a right a right, and who decides which rights are legitimate? This line of inquiry exposes a major flaw in Agenda 21: just as with the term “sustainability” (discussed earlier) ‘group or community rights’ appears to be a term and concept that will need to be defined and redefined for different communities and for different and changing circumstances. When you have an unclear concept like community rights then, just like the term sustainability, it can be easily manipulated to mean many things, and it can be used to push morally and legally corrupt agendas. There is a second problem with Communitarianism in the context of Agenda 21. Presuming that the rights of various communities and stakeholders can in some way be defined and agreed upon, then ideally it is elected government representatives who take into consideration the rights and claims

of various groups when making decisions that affect them. But, as we have seen, the implementation of Agenda 21—through regionalisation and participatory consensus—works to circumvent and override elected and accountable officials. Here the rights of stakeholders are not truly considered and respected; instead the Agenda is pushed through to override the rights of communities and individuals. There is a third major problem with Communitarianism: communities and groups do *not* have rights; only individuals, *who may then make up communities and groups*, have rights; if no individuals in a group or a community possess rights then neither does the group nor the community. Thus, Communitarianism is a pseudo-philosophy based on assuming and giving false rights to a community or group. These ‘rights’ are then ‘balanced’ against individual rights. But, as we have just seen with property rights, and will see again shortly with water rights, when it comes to Agenda 21 this ‘balancing’ of rights results in the loss or subjugation of individual rights. Thus we hear from Harvey Ruvin, Vice Chairman of ICLEI, “Individual rights will have to take a back seat to the collective.” [6].

10. Controlling People through Water Rights

Controlling the availability of, or rights to, water is one of the most direct and immediate ways to control people. This has become increasingly apparent in Australia, the driest continent in the world. Through the combined impact of several morally and criminally corrupt government policies and processes, particularly since 2004, increasing numbers of rural Australians—farmers, irrigators, growers and whole rural townships—have been increasingly deprived of water or water rights. The same group of government policies and processes have increasingly delivered the control of Australia’s water and water rights into the hands of government and large corporations, increasingly foreign owned corporations. Furthermore, a number of these policies and processes are claimed by the Australian government, specifically the Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade, in its *Report on the Implementation of the Sustainable Development Goals 2018*, to be measures that Australia is undertaking to meet its Sustainable Development Goals as part of Agenda 30. It becomes clear that in Australia Agenda 21 and Agenda 30 policies, legislation and processes are being used to deprive rural people of water ownership and water rights, and to transfer these to government and corporations as a way to control people and, in particular, move them off of the land. These same policies and processes, along with others, are also partly responsible for the recent widespread and devastating drought conditions and bushfires in Australia which are also being used to push people off of the land and into cities. The inter-related area of water ownership and rights, drought and bushfires is a large topic and much of it lies outside of the scope of this paper. For those who want more detail on this subject area please see my paper *Burning Australia: The Dumb and Deliberate Drying Out of Australia, Creation of Drought and Bushfires, and Moving People Out Of, and Big Corporations Into, Rural Australia*.

Several policies and processes driven by successive governments are combining to deprive Australians, particularly rural Australians, of water and water rights and put them into the hands of government and big corporations. These are coal-seam mining or, as it is colloquially known, fracking; the illegal building of massive *private* dams and selling of water to fill them; illegal water harvesting; the illegal privatisation and selling of Australian water including increasingly to foreign corporations; and the gross mismanagement and deliberate mismanagement of water in the Murray-Darling Basin by the Murray Darling Basin Authority (MDBA). I will very briefly cover each of these areas before pulling together the relevant points. Much more detail on these areas is available in my aforementioned paper.

Fracking is a type of mining where a well is sunk down through the underground water table into underlying coal seams, and where a mixture of water, sand and chemicals is pumped in to cause explosions in the seam to release trapped gas and bring it to the surface. Some 43,000 wells exist in Australia with plans for many more. Each well uses between 1.6 and 16 million litres of water, usually extracted from an underground water supply. The Great Artesian Basin, an underground water basin, covers a vast area of Qld, NSW and SA and feeds aquifers, springs, creeks and rivers along the east coast of Australia. Many of these springs, creeks and rivers are no longer flowing due to inadequate aquifer pressure in the Basin. Fracking (and other mining) operations are lowering and depleting the water level in the Great Artesian Basin upon which so

many Australians rely, and simultaneously, poisoning this precious water supply with toxic chemicals—so much for sustainability. [40; 41; 42; 43; 44; 45; 46; 47; 48; 49].

Floodplain harvesting is where the floodplains adjacent to rivers are modified so that when the rivers flood huge amounts of water are collected or ‘harvested’. In the Murray Darling Basin huge amounts of water are being removed through floodplain harvesting, usually by massive cotton growers such as the now infamous Cubbie Station which covers 93,000 hectares, has irrigation channels up to 75 kms long, and takes about 20 minutes to fly over in a small plane. Floodplain harvesting deprives downstream users of water.

Many private dams, some 20 to 30 in the Murray Darling Basin alone, have been built in Australia in recent years. This water is for the *private* use of large agricultural and mining companies. These dams, two of which are estimated to have cost \$30 million, are being built with *taxpayers’* money. Like floodplain harvesting, these dams are extracting large amounts of water from the system thereby depriving users downstream. By contrast, there has been less than a three percent increase in Australia’s *public* water storage since 1990. As Maryanne Slattery of the Australian Institute stated “These dams do nothing for drought-stricken communities, the health of the river or struggling farmers. These dams have been built on private land and are for the exclusive use of corporate agribusiness.... Politicians are reluctant to talk about why millions of tax payers’ dollars have been spent subsidising dams that make the problems of the Murray Darling worse.” [50; 52; 40; 41].

About 10% of Australia’s water has now been sold to foreign corporations. This, and more generally, the buying up of Australia’s water and water rights has been made possible by the 2004 National Water Initiative and the Water Act of 2007. These acts allow the buying of water rights by people or entities that do *not* live in the vicinity of the water and who do not even own land. This unregulated privatisation of Australia’s water has resulted in the progressive buying up of Australia’s water by big corporations, especially agribusiness and mining, including foreign or multinational companies, at the expense of smaller farmers, irrigators and growers and more generally of Australian rural residents and towns. There is a further and even sinister aspect to the private selling of water in Australia: it is quite clear that *Australian farmers and companies are being deliberately ousted from ownership of Australian land, water and businesses by politicians*. In her speech to parliament regarding foreign ownership Helen Dalton MP gave the example of the sale of Temora, a large diversified agribusiness. Local farmers offered \$270 million for Temora but the government sold it to a Canadian pension fund company for \$62 million less! In a further speech to parliament Helen Dalton states explicitly that she has come to see that there is in fact a *deliberate policy to wipe out Australian farmers*, something she once thought was paranoia and speculative conspiracy talk, and to put our food production in the hands of overseas corporations. [53; 54]. This is Agenda 21 in action. She also described water trading in Australia as “an unregulated disgrace.” [52].

The Murray Darling Basin Authority (MDBA) is a government body which was created under the Water Act of 2007 to manage water in the Murray Darling Basin using the Murray Darling Basin Plan. A major role of the MDBA is *buying back water rights from farmers and irrigators*. The buy back is projected to be \$13 billion and involve depriving irrigators of 1,300 gigalitres of water, equivalent to about three Sydney Harbours. [52]. This water is being used for two purposes: water trading and the environment. When water rights are purchased by farmers, irrigators or corporations from the MDBA, or other water traders, then water must be sent down the Murray Darling system to those farmers or corporations to meet their water entitlements. This results in too much water being sent down the Murray at certain times, something which is causing massive wastage (as it floods over the banks) and massive environmental damage. Using the MDBA’s own data, Maryanne Slattery of the Australia Institute, and a former senior official at the MDBA, calculated that from August 2018 to January 2019 the MDBA wasted 800,000 megalitres (approximately two Sydney Harbours) or water. [55].

A massive 70% of the water in the Murray Darling Basin is being used by the MDBA for so-called environmental purposes. The wastage here is also massive for several reasons. First, the MDBA is attempting to keep the mouth of the Murray River open by continuously flushing it using freshwater.

However, this is both unnatural and unrealistic for historically the mouth often closed over and was only open in times of high river flow. Further the MDBA is keeping the lower lakes, near the mouth of the River Murray, full of fresh water. Again this is unnatural for they are naturally estuarine environments where there is a changing mix of fresh and sea water. Each year there is massive loss of water through evaporation from these artificially created permanent lakes, approximately 850 gigalitres. So much water is being misused or stored (2.7 trillion litres per year) by the MDBA that it has clearly induced much earlier drought conditions in some areas of the Murray Darling Basin. The MDBA had wasted so much water that it had none to spare to assist the Darling River in times of low flow. In 2019 this resulted in the drying out of the river and the growth of blue green algae which resulted in a massive fish kill of some one million. [51; 56; 57; 58].

Another major disaster of the MDBA has been its water buy back and infrastructure scheme. The MDBA buys back water rights and, in turn, gives money to farmers, irrigations and corporations to build infrastructure that is supposed to return water to the river system. The scheme has returned possibly no water to the river and has allowed large corporations to generate enormous profits by misusing the scheme. [59]. Critics of the MDBA, including the South Australian Royal Commission, point out that the MDBA's policy of exchanging water rights for infrastructure scheme is benefiting private operators, mainly big agribusiness, using taxpayers' money, and where any water return to the river is *not even being audited*.

The combined impact of the Australian government's policies and practices described in the last several paragraphs has been fourfold: to deprive rural Australians of water and water rights; to increasingly put Australia's water, water rights and agricultural land into the hands of big corporations and government; to cause massive wastage of water; and to cause massive environmental damage. Among other things this has pushed people off of the land, and when they stay on the land, has given them much less control over their lives. Further, these governmental policies and practices in so far as they deprive Australians of water are illegal; they are in clear violation of Section 100 of the Australian Constitution which states: "The Commonwealth shall not by any law, or regulation of trade or commerce, abridge the right of a state or of the residents to the reasonable use of waters of rivers for conservation or irrigation." Fracking, mining, private dams, water harvesting, and the selling of water to big corporations, including foreign owned companies, are all in breach of section 100. More fundamentally of course, access to water is a basic right that must be protected by governments and not be put into the hands of private businesses, and behind them, banks, which exist to generate profit. What we have embodied in these policies and processes of the Australian government, especially through the MDBA, is Agenda 21 and 30 in action and its true nature revealed. In particular, I would conclude that the gross mismanagement by the MDBA of the Murray-Darling Basin is not simply due to stupidity, although this is in abundance, but the actions of this 'authority' are also part of a *deliberately* orchestrated campaign to bring about the fourfold outcome, and its consequences, which I have just noted.

One may say that the above policies and practices are not Agenda 21 or 30 practices. However, the Australian government does not think so. The Australian government, specifically the Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade (DFAT), had the following say about the water trading scheme and the MDBA in its *Report On the Implementation of the Sustainable Development Goals 2018*, and where it claims both these measures help meet Sustainable Development Goal 6 of Agenda 30 to "Ensure availability and sustainable management of water and sanitation for all." DFAT states: "In Australia, water markets and tradeable water entitlements have helped deliver water for consumption and environmental requirements, particularly during times of water scarcity. Water markets have been a key mechanism for Australia to adapt to climate change and manage water scarcity by providing flexibility to water users, such as irrigators, to trade water and optimise their operations and the economic benefits of their water rights." [21 p. 49]. As we have seen, this is rubbish and nothing could be further from the truth. The real nature of water trading in Australia has been, as exposed above, a disaster for ordinary Australians and for the environment—an "unregulated disgrace." In the 2018 Report DFAT also mentions the Murray-Darling Basin Plan run by the MDBA: "While the Basin Plan is a long-term policy, it has already achieved important social, economic, cultural and environmental gains. In particular, as at 31 December 2017, the Plan's water recovery target was on track to being achieved, with 2,106.4GL of water recovered or contracted to be recovered for the

environment against a target of 2,750GL by 2019. This has been achieved through the purchase of water entitlements and water efficiency improvement projects. [21 p. 50]. Again this is rubbish: the implementation of the Plan has led to disastrous social, environmental and economic consequences for all but the government and big corporations.

11. Depopulation and Moving the Remaining Population Into Human Settlement Zones

Chapter 5 of Agenda 21 entitled Demographic Dynamics and Sustainability is about how the large number of humans, or “the growth of world population”, is affecting the planet, and what needs to be done. It is recommended that governments include a “full integration of population concerns into national planning, policy and decision-making processes.” [Ch 5, Sec. 17]. However, Agendas 21 and 30 do not give anything specific about population levels or talk about *depopulation*. But here is what section 11.2.3.2 of the *Global Biodiversity Assessment*—which grew out of the UN Convention on Biological Diversity, one of three legal binding treaties produced at the UN Conference on Environment and Development held in Rio de Janeiro in 1992 and which also produced Agenda 21—says about depopulation: “A reasonable estimate for an industrialized world society at the present North American material standard of living would be one billion. At the more frugal European standard of living, 2-3 billion would be possible.” [34 pp. 96, 85]. It may be objected that what is said in the *Global Biodiversity Assessment* does not apply to Agenda 21 although both issued from the same UN conference. However, this is not the case for this is what our friend Maurice Strong, the leader of the UN Conference on Environment and Development, said about population: “Either we reduce the world's population voluntarily or nature will do this for us, but brutally.” [23].

In addition to depopulation, the real and dark agenda of Agendas 21 and 30 is to move the population off of rural areas into settlement zones, primarily cities. Again turning to the *Global Biodiversity Assessment*, in section 13.4.2.2.3 (p. 993) it states that “representative areas of all major ecosystems in a region need to be reserved, that blocks should be as large as possible, that buffer zones should be established around core areas, and that corridors should connect these areas. This basic design is central to the recently proposed Wildlands Project in the United States.” [14]. Now consider “this basic design” as described in the Wildlands Project: “...that *at least half* of the land area of the 48 conterminous states should be encompassed in core reserves and inner corridor zones (essentially extensions of core reserves) within the next few decades.... Nonetheless, half of a region in wilderness is a reasonable guess of what it will take to restore viable populations of large carnivores and natural disturbance regimes, assuming that most of the other 50 percent is managed intelligently as buffer zones. Eventually, a wilderness network would dominate a region...with human habitations *being the islands. The native ecosystem and the collective needs of non-human species must take precedence over the needs and desires of humans.*” (My italics.) [14]. The map entitled the “Simulated Reserve and Corridor System to Protect Biodiversity, as Required by the UN Convention On Biological Diversity (or by the *Global Biodiversity Assessment*), Wildlands Project, UN and US Man and Biosphere Programs and World Heritage Program as a Vital Step in Attaining Sustainable Development”, and which was prepared for US Senator Kay Bailey Hutchinson when making her objections to the UN Convention on Biological Diversity in the senate, denies human access to about 80% of the US land mass! [2 p. 57; 7 p. 621-5].

12. The Global and Complete Monitoring and Measuring of All Resources and Activities

For Agendas 21 and 30 to work there must be the continuous monitoring and measuring of most, ideally all, of the world resources and activities, and this includes humans (as a resource) and human activity. If resources and activities are to be managed sustainably by governments and corporations then continuous monitoring and measuring is essential to show what activities are occurring, what resources are being used, how much of what resources are being used, and what impacts activities and resource use are having economically, environmentally and socially. Consequently, throughout both Agendas 21 and 30 the need for data collection, what form it should take, and the financing of it, is repeatedly discussed. Central to this discussion is the need to harmonise and integrate this data collection across the world with the UN at the

centre of operations. The reader will find that nearly every chapter of Agenda 21 has a section in it that has something to do with data collection. For example, Chapter 14, Promoting Sustainable Agriculture and Rural Development, has a goal to “process, store and analyse animal genetic data at the global level.” [Ch. 14, Sec. 68 b]. The need for integrated and harmonised regional, national and global data collection, and auditing, of all resources, is made most clear and most fully described in Chapter 35 entitled Science For Sustainable Development, especially Sections 17 a and 17b, and in Chapter 40 entitled Information for Decision Making. In the latter chapter section 9 states “Relevant international organizations [e.g. the UN] should develop practical recommendations for *coordinated, harmonized collection and assessment* of data at the *national and international levels*. National and international data and information centres should set up *continuous* and accurate data-collection systems...” (My italics and interpolation.) Each Sustainable Development Goal of Agenda 30 has a series of indicators to show that it is being met, and data must be collected on each of these. Thus Section 83 of the Agenda states: “Follow-up and review at the high-level political forum will be informed by an annual progress report on the Sustainable Development Goals to be prepared by the Secretary-General in cooperation with the United Nations system, based on the global indicator Framework and data produced by national statistical systems and information collected at the regional level.” Finally, here is what the UN Data Revolution Group stated about the new need for data in their first report *A World that Counts*: “Despite considerable progress in recent years, whole groups of people are not being counted and important aspects of people’s lives and environmental conditions are still not measured... As the world embarks on an ambitious project to meet new Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), there is an urgent need to mobilise the data revolution for *all people and the whole planet* in order to monitor progress, hold governments accountable and foster sustainable development...” [29]. (My italics.)

Of course, the central problem with the monitoring, measuring and auditing of all resources and activities is that it is, on the one hand, a gross violation of privacy, which *automatically* acts to prevent people from expressing themselves freely i.e. curtails liberty, while on the other hand, it provides the information required not just for the control of resources and activities but the *greedy, inhumane and malevolent* control of resources and activities—and indeed, Agendas 21 and 30 are ultimately about the greedy, inhumane and malevolent control of the world’s resources, activities and its people. The most clear and acute example of the monitoring, measuring and control of resources, activities and people under Agendas 21 and 30 is the advent of smart cities as part of building sustainable communities.

13. Agendas 21 and 30 and Smart Cities, Smart Growth and Smart Growth

As discussed, particularly in sections 8, 10 and 11 of this paper, Agendas 21 and 30 seek to move people off of rural areas and, we may add, into cities. Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) 11 of Agenda 30 is to “Make cities and human settlements inclusive, safe, resilient and sustainable.” In the *Report on the Implementation of the Sustainable Development Goals 2018* prepared by the Australian government, an overview is provided of what Australia is doing to meet the SDGs of Agenda 30. Regarding SDG 11, the Report states that Australia is developing what are called “smart cities” to help meet this SDG. This is being done through initiatives and programs such as City Deals and the The Smart Cities and Suburbs Program. Importantly for our present discussion, it is also stated that “Both private and public sectors are investing in mobile and fixed telecommunications infrastructure in Australian cities and communities, providing a platform for smarter, more sustainable cities, which could also be supported by 5G and other emerging technologies.” [5 pp. 75-7]. Turning to the Department of Infrastructure, Transport, Cities, and Regional Development website (infrastructure.gov.au) we find that the government is committed to the new Smart Cities Plan, and that smart cities are part of meeting Sustainable Development Goal 11. As Ethan Nash at *Tott News* states, this Plan “represents a framework for cities policy at the federal level, and it will guide action across various portfolios to deliver ‘sustainable’ outcomes for cities and the people who live in them. The Smart Cities Plan sets out the Australian government’s vision for our cities, and it includes three pillars: Smart Investment, Smart Policy and Smart Technology. Key domestic initiatives include the Smart Cities Plan, City Deals, the Smart Cities and Suburbs Program and the National Cities Performance Framework.” \$50 million dollars has been granted for 52 smart initiatives. [17]. We should note also that ICLEI supports

smart cities. On its website (probably around 2010) it states: ‘ICLEI promotes local action for global sustainability and supports cities to become sustainable, resilient, resource-efficient, biodiverse, low-carbon; *to build a smart infrastructure*; and to develop an inclusive, green urban economy. The ultimate aim is to achieve healthy and happy communities.’ (My italics.).

What is a smart city? In the context of Agendas 21 and 30 a smart city is, essentially and actually, where technology is used to continuously monitor and surveil all of the resources, activities and people in the city for the purpose of controlling, using and influencing those resources, activities and people for the purpose of creating efficient and thus sustainable, or what is the same, resilient, cities. Because of the continuous and pervasive monitoring and surveillance they use, smart cities are *also* supposedly being used to prevent terrorism and more generally crime.

The black heart of the technological infrastructure for monitoring, surveillance, measuring and control in smart cities or urban areas is the new 5G Network or Fifth Generation Network, also called the Smart Grid or Internet of Things. This network will in part consist of a system of thousands upon thousands of small transmitting and receiving mini-towers throughout the whole area in which the network is operating. They will be placed every 100 to 300 metres along every road and generally attached to light posts and other existing roadway fixtures. The high number of ‘towers’ or transmitters is due to the fact that the high frequencies—around 3.5 to 90 gigahertz—used by the 5G Network travel relatively poorly. Next, these ‘towers’ will be wirelessly communicating with all smart phones and all other smart devices such as smart meters. A smart meter is a device attached to a home (business, etc.) which is able to wirelessly measure the input, output and workings of pieces of wireless technology or equipment in the home and communicate this, wirelessly, to a receiver such as a mini-tower in the street or modified normal phone towers which are also part of the 5G Network. New sensors are rolling out to be installed in everything from clothing, appliances, building materials, automobiles, cosmetics, toys, computers, furniture, etc. Over time, it is expected that *all* pieces of technology and equipment, plus most other things, will be directly or indirectly and wirelessly linked to and communicating with the 5G Network or Smart Grid, hence it is also called the Internet of All Things. We should note that an ever-growing number of facial recognition cameras will be linked up to the Smart Grid. (The technology company Nvidia estimates there will be around one billion facial recognition cameras in the world’s cities by 2020. [65 p. 59].) Apart from being a network for total surveillance, the 5G Smart Grid, will massively increase our exposure to microwave radiation, and *will* be a disaster for human health. Those who wish to know more about this issue and the 5G Network can see my paper *Microwave Radiation from Mobile Phones and Other Wireless Devices, and the 5G Network or Smart Grid*.

The 5G Network is being sold to us on a number of grounds, but a central one is that many resources and activities will be able to be monitored and measured so that they can be used in the most efficient, economic and sustainable ways. The classic example is that you will be able to monitor how much power you are using at any time and reduce accordingly. What you are *not* being told is that power companies will, eventually, charge you more during times of peak usage, which they can now monitor, to ensure sustainable usage and, of course, to make more money. Alternatively, the power companies will themselves control or reduce your access to electricity when *they* deem it necessary—something which they will now be able to do wirelessly via smart meters. Really, it’s about controlling your power supply and thus, you. This is one small example of the principle that when everything is connected to the 5G Network everything will be able to be monitored, measured and controlled. Indeed, anyone or any organisation which has access to the 5G Network or Smart Grid, whether legally or *illegally*, will be able to use the 5G Network for the following: 1) All of your personal data on the network, and eventually there will be a *lot* of it, can be accessed or stolen. 2) All pieces of technology and equipment in your home connected to the 5G Network or Smart Grid can be individually monitored regarding their operation e.g. power used, time of use. From this data, software can be used to build a detailed profile of the people—their habits, needs, character, etc.—using this technology and equipment—including whether or not you are at home, sleeping, etc. 3) All of your technology connected with the 5G Network can be remotely controlled or shut down. 4) Smart devices such as phones, smart meters, and smart televisions can be used to provide *audio and visual* surveillance of the user and his

or her surroundings. A quick search on the internet soon reveals that many/most new smart devices will be increasingly equipped with these two way audio and visual receivers. 5) The frequencies used in the 5G Network also have the capacity for 3-D mapping of your home and your personal location in real time. (This 3D scanning is the function of airport scanners which use the same frequencies as the 5G network.)

Of course, no-one will be putting us under surveillance...right? Well, not in the US. James Clapper, former head of the NSA or National Security Agency, one of the major intelligence agencies in the US, said in 2016, to a Senate panel as part of his annual assessment of threats against the US: “In the future, intelligence services might use the [internet of things] for identification, surveillance, monitoring, location tracking, and targeting for recruitment, or to gain access to networks or user credentials,” (I think we should read ‘will’ instead of ‘might’.) But the US government has known about the potential to exploit the 5G Network for a long time. Back in 2012 the then CIA director David Petraeus made clear that intelligence agencies would use the internet of things (5G Network) to spy on people. At the In-Q-Tel CEO Summit in 2012 he stated: “The current ‘Internet of PCs’ [personal computers] will move, of course, toward an ‘Internet of Things’—of devices of all types—50 to 100 billion of which will be connected to the Internet by 2020.... Items of interest will be located, identified, monitored and remotely controlled through technologies such as radio-frequency identification, sensor networks, tiny embedded servers, and energy harvesters – all connected to the next-generation Internet [i.e. 5G Network] using abundant, low-cost, and high-power computing.... In practice, these technologies could lead to rapid integration of data from closed societies [i.e. societies where 5G exists], and provide near-continuous, persistent monitoring of virtually anywhere we [e.g. the CIA] choose.” (My interpolations.) But this surveillance won’t happen in Australia...right? Well, we do know that the 5G Network will need to be under some degree of continuous intelligence surveillance because, eventually, all of the nation’s technology, data, communications, utilities, telcos, and other essential services will be using it or connected to it.

To reiterate: it is intended that not only every piece of technology will be directly or indirectly connected to the 5G Network or Smart Grid, but every food item, every piece of clothing, every household item, every medicine, etc., everything, will have an embedded microprocessor or sensor—much of it at the nano-metre scale—so that it can be monitored, measured, tracked or controlled via the Smart Grid. (One nano-metre equals one billionth of a metre.) The Smart Grid as the central piece of infrastructure in smart cities will be a mechanism for *total* surveillance and control. Not so smart after all huh? Well, not for normal people. One last point: we must remember that the 5G Network or Smart Grid will be a *global* network of surveillance and control, thus, the “International Electrotechnical Commission (IEC) has already laid out a global roadmap to insure the interoperability of Smart Grid systems among nations.” [34 p. 149]—nothing less than a world-wide electromagnetic surveillance and control grid i.e. a prison.

14. Enslaving You with Your Own Wealth

Chapter 33 Section 18 of Agenda 21 estimates that the cost of its implementation from 1993 to 2000 will be \$600 billion with \$125 billion given in grants or on concessional terms. Money for developing countries would come from Official Development Assistance (ODA) i.e. foreign financial aid, from the World Bank, and from the UN Development Programme and UN Environmental Programme, while developed countries would self-finance. However, by the time Agenda 30 arrived the UN bureaucrats were estimating that the costs of Agenda 30 would be in the order of \$3 to \$5 *trillion* per year. In the *From Billions to Trillions* report released by the World Bank in July 2015 it was conceded that “To meet the investment needs of the Sustainable Development Goals. The global community needs to move the discussion from ‘Billions’ in ODA to ‘Trillions’ in investments of all kinds: public and private, national and global, in both capital and capacity.” [18]. Not surprisingly perhaps, as of 2015 there were no official estimates of the costs of implementing the reductions in carbon emissions agreed to by the various countries at the 2015 Paris Climate Summit. In 2015 the first unofficial estimate was made by adjunct Professor Bjorn Lomborg and presented to a committee of the US House of Representatives. He estimated that the cost to the world of implementing the Paris agreement would be \$924 billion if done effectively and nearly two trillion dollars if it was ineffectively implemented. [63 pp. 225-8]. Of course, the climate change hoax is all part of Agendas

21 and 30. The question is: ‘Who is going to pay for Agendas 21 and 30?’ The answer is: ‘You are going to pay for your own enslavement and that of your fellow human beings.’ The money will come from the general population through increased taxes. This process will include national governments having to borrow more heavily from large private banks, including the World Bank and International Monetary Fund, and go more heavily into debt to these mega-banks, more specifically the people who own them—the same people who are behind Agendas 21 and 30.

References

1. *Rosa Koire Speech On Agenda 21*. (YouTube Sept. 2012).
2. *Behind the Green Mask: UN Agenda 21*. (Book by Rosa Koire, 2011).
3. *A Critical Analysis of Agenda 21—United Nations Program of Action*. (Article by Connecting the Agenda, Nov. 2013, located at connectingtheagenda.com).
4. *Agenda 21: United Nations Sustainable Development*
5. *Transforming Our World: The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development*.
6. *Agenda 21 in One Easy Lesson*. (Article by Tom DeWeese, April 2011, located at newswithviews.com).
7. *The Perception Deception*. (Book by David Icke, 2013).
8. *All You Need to Know and Have Never Been Told*. (Book by David Icke, 2017).
9. icleioceania.org
10. iclei.org
11. *Our Community Our Future: A Guide to Local Agenda 21*. (Document published by the NGO Environs Australia: the Local Government Environment Network, 1999).
12. *An Introduction & Chronology of Agenda 21 in Australia (Part 1)*. (Article by Graham Williamson, August 2017, located at the.catallaxyfiles.com).
13. *An Introduction & Chronology of Agenda 21 in Australia (Part 2)*. (Article by Graham Williamson, August 2017, located at the.catallaxyfiles.com).
14. *Special Report on Sustainable Development: Transforming America*. (Article by Henry Lamb, Dec. 2005, located at thedemocratsagainstunagenda21.com).
15. Sustainabledevelopment.un.org
16. *The UN Takeover of Australian Society*. (Article at *Tott News*, April 2019).
17. *Australian Bushfires: A Smart City Conspiracy?* (Article by Ethan Nash, Dec. 2019, at *Tott News*).
18. *UN Agenda 2030: A Recipe for Global Socialism*. (Article by Alex Newman).

19. *Agenda 21: The UN Strategy to Enslave the World*. (Article by Louis Cook, March 2013).
20. *Habitat III New Urban Agenda, Draft Outcome for Adoption in Quito, October 2016*.
21. *Report On the Implementation of the Sustainable Development Goals 2018*. (found at sdgdata.gov.au)
22. *Australia's Biodiversity Conservation Strategy 2010-30* (At environment.gov.au).
23. [www.azquotes.com/author/14256-Maurice Strong](http://www.azquotes.com/author/14256-Maurice%20Strong)
24. *Agnenda21/30 9* (Three page information document produced by One Nation Party).
25. *What Is Agenda 21*. (Article by John Smeed, Oct. 2013, located at galileomovement.com.au).
26. *Councils, Property Rights & Democracy: What You Should Know*. (Article at galileomovement.com.au).
27. *UN Agenda 21 (AG21) In Brief*. (Article by Graham Williamson, Feb. 2013, located at galileomovement.com.au)
28. *Agenda 21 Facts & Quotes*. (Article by Graham Williamson, Feb. 2015 galileomovement.com.au)
29. *Checking the 'Fine Print' of the UN's Post-2015 Sustainability Agenda*. (Article by Graham Williamson, Oct. 2015, located at galileomovement.com.au)
30. *Agenda 21 in Australia: FAQ's About the UN Program the Politicians Prefer Not to Talk About*. (Article by Graham Williamson, March 2015, 2nd edition, located at galileomovement.com.au)
31. *Agenda 21: Ending the Deception & Moving Forward*. (Article by Graham Williamson, March 2013 (Revised), located at galileomovement.com.au)
32. *ICLEI, 'Sustainability', & Agenda 21: Politicians Support UN AG21 Program, & Demonise Anyone Who Dares Question It*. (Article by Graham Williamson, August 2013, 3rd edition, located at galileomovement.com.au).
33. Post Sustainability Institute (postsustainability.org)
34. *Technocracy Rising: The Trojan Horse of Global Transformation*. (Book by Patrick Wood, 2015).
35. *The Sustainable Development Cabal of the United Nations is Meeting Again*. (Article by Ileana Johnson Plough, July 2018).
36. *Globalisaton: A Very Short Introduction*. (Book by Manfred Steger, 2015).
37. *Nine Lies: How The Gas Cartel Clouted Australia With Price Rises* (Article by Michael West, July 2018).
38. *The Ultimate Gouge: Why Australia, The World's #1 Exporter, Now Imports Gas*. (Article by Michael West, July 2019).

39. *Altered Genes Twisted Truth: How the Venture to Genetically Modify Our Food has Subverted Science, Corrupted Government, and Systematically Deceived the Public.* (Book by Steven Druker, 2015).
40. *Wake Up Australia Or Die—Make This Viral.* (YouTube video by Max Igan, Dec. 2019)
41. *Drought By Design—The Genociding Of Australia.* (YouTube video by Max Igan, Dec. 2019)
42. *Australia—Water Deprivation—Incendiary Fuelled Fires.* (YouTube video by Max Igan, Dec. 2019)
43. *Australia—The Perfect Firestorm—Created By Design.* (YouTube video by Max Igan, Dec. 2019)
44. *An Australian Holocaust.* (YouTube video by Max Igan, Jan. 2020)
45. *Wikipedia.org, Great Artesian Basin*
46. *Four Corners: The Gas Rush.* (YouTube video, 2011)
47. *The Dangers Of Fracking And Why It Must Be Stopped.* (Article from wakeupworld.com)
48. *Fracking: A Process That Destroys Our Underground Water Supplies.* (Article from wakeupworld.com)
49. *Gasland.* (2010 documentary by Josh Fox).
50. *Dams Are Being Built But They Are Private.* (Article by Michelle Graton, Oct. 2019, located at *The Conversation*).
51. *The Murray Darling Basin Authority: A UN Agenda 2030 Implementation Plan?* (Article by Phil Hingston).
52. *Helen Talks Water Mismanagement With Alan Jones.* (YouTube Video, 2019).
53. Helen Dalton's speech to parliament regarding foreign ownership. (Video which can be accessed on her Facebook page.)
54. *The Myth Of NSW Public Dam Infrastructure.* (YouTube video of a parliamentary speech by Helen Dalton).
55. *Scandal Wasting Millions Of Litres Of Water During Australia's Worst Drought.* (YouTube video of 60 Minutes expose, Oct. 2019).
56. *The MDBA's Zombie Water.* (YouTube video by Topher Field, May 2019).
57. *The Source of the MDBA Problem.* (YouTube video by Topher Field, May 2019).
58. *The MDBAs Man Made Drought.* (YouTube Video by Topher Field, 2019)
59. *Cash Splash: Taxpayers Dollars, Secretive Deals And The Lucrative Business Of Water.* (Expose by the ABC's *Four Corners* program, July 2019).
60. *Wikipedia.org, Maurice Strong.*

61. *The Dark Story Behind Global Warming*. (Article by William Engdhal, Oct 2018. located on his website.)
62. *Australia's Smart City Development Progresses*. (Article by Ethan Nash, Feb. 2020, at *Tott News*).
63. *Climate Change: The Facts 2017*. (Book of papers edited by Jennifer Marohasy, 2017).
64. *Agenda 21: An Expose of the United Nation's Sustainable Development Initiative and the Forfeiture of American Sovereignty and Liberties*. (Book by Ron Taylor, 2016).
65. *Technocracy: The Hard Road to World Order*. (Book by Patrick Wood, 2018).
