

# **AGENDA 21 IN AUSTRALIA**

## **FAQ's about the UN program the politicians prefer not to talk about**

**Graham Williamson  
August 2016 (4<sup>th</sup> edit.)**

### **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

This paper, by reference to numerous authoritative sources, addresses many commonly asked questions regarding the United Nations Agenda 21 program in Australia.

In a simple easily accessed format, questions such as the following are addressed.

- **What is Agenda 21?**
- **Is there a connection between UN climate claims and Agenda 21?**
- **Isn't Agenda 21 just a voluntary, unenforceable agreement?**
- **Who is responsible for implementing Agenda 21?**
- **Is Agenda 21 democratically based?**
- **How is it possible to implement a UN program for 20 years without giving the people a democratic choice?**
- **Is Agenda 21 illegal or unconstitutional?**
- **How will Agenda 21 affect me?**
- **What is the best means of countering Agenda 21 & restoring democracy?**

**This paper is of vital importance to all Australians who value freedom and democracy.**

At a time when the mainstream media, through incompetence and through pursuit of their own agendas, continue to abandon their watchdog role and let the people down, it is essential that the people take that extra effort to ensure they are correctly and fully informed.

**Democracy, without full and correct information, and genuine choice, is as good as a dictatorship.**

## Introduction

This brief article is intended to give an overview of [Agenda 21](#) in Australia by answering various commonly asked questions.

The following information is based upon extensive research, more details of which may be found here ([1](#), [2](#), [3](#), [4](#), [5](#), [6](#), [7](#), [8](#)).

Agenda 21, being a program which has endured for more than two decades, has had bipartisan support, and has been implemented Australia wide by all 3 levels of government, can rightly be considered one of the most massive far reaching policy initiatives ever implemented in Australia.

The fact that most Australians remain unaware of this program and its affects is a sad reflection upon the state of democracy in Australia.

Agenda 21 is the wonderful planet saving UN program that the politicians [prefer NOT to mention in public, especially during election campaigns](#).

Becoming informed is your responsibility.

## What is 'Agenda 21'?

[Agenda 21](#) is the United Nations global program for the 21<sup>st</sup> century. It is an attempt by the UN to control people and resources throughout the world under the guise of protecting the environment and assuring the ecological sustainability of the world. The United Nations adopts the view that only a global 'solution' will be effective and therefore all the countries of the world are required to transfer political power and finance to the UN, and cooperate with their requirements. All in the claimed interests of 'sustainability' ([9](#)). The UN will decide what they consider to be [sustainable](#), as well as [unsustainable practices](#), which must either be restricted or cease completely.

Agenda 21 is part of post war attempts to create a new (global) world order, [a fact noted by the OECD](#) and cited by the [Foreign Investment Review Board \(FIRB\)](#) in the [Appendix to their 2001 Annual Report in which they state](#):

*"Governments are co-operating with each other and with other actors to strengthen the international legal and policy framework in which business is conducted. The post-war period has seen the development of this framework, starting with the adoption in 1948 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Recent instruments include the ILO Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work, the Rio Declaration on Environment and Development and Agenda 21 and the Copenhagen Declaration for Social Development."*

Agenda 21, developed by [Maurice Strong](#), was intended to be [the "Plan of Action" for the Earth Charter](#), which was developed by [Maurice Strong and Mikhail S. Gorbachev](#):

*"The Earth Charter was proposed during the preparatory process to the UN Conference on Environment and Development -- best known as the Earth Summit -- held in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, in 1992..... Writing in 'Where on Earth are we Going?', Strong says: 'As a result of endless consultation and advice, we decided to recommend to the Preparatory Committee that the conference be designed to produce a Declaration of Principles, which I proposed should be in the form of an Earth Charter, and a Plan of Action, which came to be called Agenda 21. The Earth Charter would reaffirm and build on the Declaration of the Stockholm Conference, IUCN's Covenant and similar statements that have emerged from other international processes, setting out basic principles to guide the*

*conduct of nations and people toward each other and the Earth.*

*'The Earth Charter would set out the basic principles for the conduct of people and nations toward each other and the Earth to ensure our common future'.*"

**The Earth Charter acknowledged** that as countries became weaker and more **"interdependent"**, the world would become more **"fragile"**, and as a result, countries must **"demilitarize"** and submit to the requirements of the UN:

*"As the world becomes increasingly interdependent and fragile, the future at once holds great peril and great promise. ....we affirm the following interdependent principles for a sustainable way of life as a common standard by which the conduct of all individuals, organizations, businesses, governments, and transnational institutions is to be guided and assessed.....Demilitarize national security systems to the level of a non-provocative defense posture, and convert military resources to peaceful purposes, including ecological restoration.....As never before in history, common destiny beckons us to seek a new beginning. Such renewal is the promise of these Earth Charter principles. To fulfill this promise, we must commit ourselves to adopt and promote the values and objectives of the Charter. This requires a change of mind and heart. It requires a new sense of global interdependence and universal responsibility.....In order to build a sustainable global community, the nations of the world must renew their commitment to the United Nations, fulfill their obligations under existing international agreements, and support the implementation of Earth Charter principles with an international legally binding instrument on environment and development."*

Agenda 21 produced numerous spin-offs under varying names, all coming under the umbrella term 'ecological sustainability'. Various organisations were established to assist in promoting and implementing AG21. One such organisation was [Green Cross International](#), which was established by Mikhail S. Gorbachev to [promote global implementation of Agenda 21, as also noted by ECC](#). Another was [ICLEI](#), specifically established to promote Agenda 21 implementation by local Councils around the world (6).

[Green Cross Australia](#) was formed by Mikhail Gorbachev, then Queensland Premier Peter Beattie, and Lord Mayor Campbell Newman, following [Brisbane Festival's Earth Dialogue in 2006](#). Funding for the formation of Green Cross Australia was [supplied by then Mayor Campbell Newman and new Premier, Anna Bligh](#). Green Cross Australia [foundation members](#) included, Phillip Adams, Anna Bligh, Margaret De Wit, Ian Dunlop, Campbell Newman, Jane Prentice, and many others. [Green Cross Australia CEO is Mara Bun](#), formerly [Business Development Director at CSIRO](#). [Initial Partners of Green Cross Australia](#) included the Queensland government, Brisbane City Council, the Earth Charter, and Griffith University. [IUCN](#) is also a [Partner with Green Cross](#), and the [Commonwealth and State governments in Australia are members of IUCN](#).

[Green Cross Australia played a large role in education](#), and indoctrination of our children with the principles of the United Nations Agenda 21 program. The ["Plan of Action"](#) resulting from the Earth Dialogue Festival in Brisbane included the ["incorporation of the Earth Charter into Queensland Education's environmental curricula."](#) To this end Green Cross developed the [Green Lane Diary](#) to [target schoolchildren](#). According to Katy Orell in [Global Education magazine](#):

*"The Green Lane Environmental Diary program, founded in 1999 by Green Cross, is a school-based educational initiative promoting sustainable development and inspiring students to become agents of transformative change in their own communities. The initiative underscores a central aim of the Earth Charter Declaration to 'provide all, especially children and youth, with educational opportunities that empower them to contribute actively to sustainable development'.....The Green Lane Diary falls in line with ideas laid out in the United Nation's Agenda 21 plan of action for sustainable development.....In 2010, Green Cross Australia introduced the first English-language*

*version of Green Lane Diary, guided by the framework of the Japanese model. The project was so well funded that for two years, the diaries were printed and distributed for free. In 2013, Green Cross rolled out the first e-version of Green Lane Diary.”*

The Green Lane Diary, though described as “[\*revolutionary\*](#)”, was well [supported by Australian politicians and teachers](#).

In their “[Appeal for Peace](#)”, endorsed by the Queensland government, the Brisbane Earth Dialogue stated:

- *“There can be no sustainable peace if we fail to rise to the global challenge presented by climate change.”*
- *“Everyone needs to become an activist.”*
- *“Young people, the greatest natural resource of all, must be educated about sustainable development.”*
- *“Citizens should call on their governments to transfer resources away from military expenditure towards areas such as environmental protection...”*

Meanwhile, in NSW, [Education Minister John Aquilina](#) was also busy indoctrinating schoolchildren with the UN Agenda 21 plan.

[According to the Earth Dialogues Geneva Declaration in 2013](#), urgent moves are needed to legally enforce control of climate change and global finance:

*“The framework of international law must be strengthened and legally - binding agreements rapidly engaged, especially for climate change mitigation and adaptation and for effective supervision and regulation to stabilize the international financial system. ...The issues we face are now of such a scale and intensity that those nations which recognise the seriousness and urgency of the existential threats to the future of humanity must move ahead in the common interest, leaving aside those who do not”*

**The Earth Charter, the Earth Dialogue, Agenda 21, and Green Cross, all require everyone, including schoolchildren, to become activists or agents of change to oppose the sovereignty and independence of their own countries and support the UN global agenda.**

**Agenda 21 is a program with no defined destination and no end. The completion date, and the final projected cost, will remain unknown indefinitely.**

## **Is Agenda 21 the same thing as ‘ecological sustainability’?**

Yes, the terms “Agenda 21” and “ecologically sustainable development” (ESD) are used synonymously. The Agenda 21 program is a guide to achieving the UN’s version of politically controlled ecological sustainability. Legally, Agenda 21 is implemented in Australia under the [1992 Intergovernmental Agreement on the Environment](#) and the [National Strategy for Ecologically Sustainable Development \(ESD\)](#).

## **Is there a connection between UN climate claims & Agenda 21?**

Yes. According to UN claims, humans are causing dangerous global warming or climate change, and this is considered by the UN to be a global problem which threatens sustainability, hence it forms one part of Agenda 21, and has been included by the UN in the Agenda 21 document. This connection has been confirmed by those responsible for implementing Agenda 21 in Australia ([10](#)).

## But Isn't Agenda 21 'non-binding' or voluntary?

[Agenda 21](#) was initially promoted as a [voluntary](#) or [non-binding](#) (non-binding on government) international agreement, however a number of mechanisms are commonly used to ensure such agreements ultimately become binding (on the people).

### 1. Agenda 21 Agreement Required Governments to Pass Enforcing Domestic Legislation

Firstly, [Chapter 8 of Agenda 21](#) required that the provisions of Agenda 21 be incorporated into the domestic laws of signatory countries through such mechanisms as a "*national strategy for sustainable development*." In addition, Chapter 8 of Agenda 21 demanded:

- The full "*integration*" or embedding of sustainability and environmental issues
- In devising domestic laws, strategies, and policies, government should "*cooperate with international organisations*" and should consider their "*international obligations*".
- Government should ensure "*enactment and enforcement of laws and regulations at the regional, national, state, or local/municipal level*"
- Domestic laws should be assessed and monitored by "*international organisations*" and "*other countries*"

Most noteworthy, the required laws were to be monitored internationally, NOT democratically by the Australian people.

#### [According to sections 8.3 -8.26 of Agenda 21:](#)

*8.3. 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.....*

*a. To conduct a national review of economic, sectoral and environmental policies, strategies and plans to ensure the progressive integration of environmental and developmental issues;*

*b. To strengthen institutional structures to allow the full integration of environmental and developmental issues, at all levels of decision-making;*

*c. To develop or improve mechanisms to facilitate the involvement of concerned individuals, groups and organizations in decision-making at all levels;*

*d. To establish domestically determined procedures to integrate environment and development issues in decision-making.....*

*8.4. The primary need is to integrate environmental and developmental decision-making processes...*

*8.6. Countries could develop systems for monitoring and evaluation of progress towards achieving sustainable development by adopting indicators that measure changes across economic, social and environmental dimensions.*

*8.7. Governments, in cooperation, where appropriate, with international organizations, should adopt a national strategy for sustainable development based on, inter alia, the implementation of decisions taken at the Conference, particularly in respect of Agenda 21.....*

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

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

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

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

8.16. The overall objective is to promote, in the light of country -specific conditions, the integration of environment and development policies through appropriate legal and regulatory policies, instruments and enforcement mechanisms at the national, state, provincial and local level.....

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

8.21. Each country should develop integrated strategies to maximize compliance with its laws and regulations relating to sustainable development, with assistance from international organizations and other countries as appropriate. The strategies could include:

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

b. Mechanisms for promoting compliance;

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

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

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

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

The challenge for the Australian government however, is simply stated:

**How is it possible to [bypass democratic scrutiny](#) to enable implementation of such potentially unpopular and politically suicidal anti-Australian reforms?**

Successive Australian governments cooperated with the UN and undemocratically incorporated the provisions of Agenda 21 and the [Rio agreement](#) into domestic legislation through the [National Strategy for Ecologically Sustainable Development](#), the [Intergovernmental Agreement on the Environment](#), and subsequent environmental, native vegetation, and biodiversity Acts. The

[Intergovernmental Agreement on the Environment \(IGAE\)](#) even required signatories (PM + Premiers) to acknowledge that the Australian Constitution is no longer relevant in the era of UN globalisation:

*“RECOGNISE that environmental concerns and impacts respect neither physical nor political boundaries and are increasingly taking on inter-jurisdictional, international and global significance in a way that was not contemplated by those who framed the Australian Constitution”*

Significantly, [as was pointed out by Rob Fowler](#), the IGAE *“was developed primarily by State government officials behind closed doors and was never subjected to any public consultation.”* As Fowler points out, the IGAE transferred responsibility to the Commonwealth to ensure *“the negotiation of international agreements relating to the environment and ensuring that consequential international obligations are met by Australia.”* It would seem that the Commonwealth, and all the states, unanimously agreed that any democratic scrutiny or approval would be undesirable.

Concern about the undemocratic nature of intergovernmental agreements was also expressed by David Ash in [“Free the Fourth Arm”](#):

*“The problem has only been confirmed by the House of Representatives Standing Committee on Legal and Constitutional Affairs. In June it produced its post-2020 summit paper on reforming the constitution. It has one recommendation in respect to Federation, that the Government introduce the requirement for **intergovernmental** agreements to be automatically referred to a parliamentary committee for scrutiny and report to the parliament.*

*This is serious stuff. As the committee says, “Australia now has a system of government that relies on hundreds of complex agreements between federal and state authorities made through **intergovernmental** forums that have no formal authority under the constitution”. What is happening, and happening behind closed doors, is the silent spread of a quasi-legislative scheme.*

*Is a committee the right body to oversee all this? Of course the regime must be policed. But when breaches occur - and, major or minor, they will - who should resolve them? A federal parliamentary committee, subject to the whim of politics and with no input from states? Or a court, with its necessary legalisms and delay?*

*Is there in the constitution itself some body, something of permanence which will be accorded respect, so that these complex agreements can be controlled and so that the rest of us know what's going on?”*

Ash points out that there is such a mechanism in Sections 101 and 103 of the Constitution which allows for the creation of an independent **Inter-State Commission (ISC)**. [According to Ash](#):

*“COAG is breeding a substratum of **intergovernmental** arrangements that only an independent body can govern.....The original ISC may well have been misconceived. But it is in the constitution and regarded as important by the constitution. “*

Politicians however, do not have a good record when it comes to exposing their activities to democratic scrutiny.

In 2008, because of *“concerns regarding the escalation of intergovernmental agreements and the lack of transparency and oversight applied to these agreements,”* the House of Representatives Standing Committee on Legal and Constitutional Affairs [tabled its report on the inquiry into Constitutional reform entitled \*Reforming our Constitution\*](#). The Committee, in their one official recommendation, refused to recommend democratic scrutiny by the public, preferring instead to recommend *“scrutiny of intergovernmental agreements by a parliamentary committee.”*

In their report though, the Committee criticised the lack of public scrutiny of intergovernmental agreements:

*“2.48 Judicial interpretation and intergovernmental agreements are both practical means by which problems in the Constitution can be overcome. However the framers of the Constitution intended that the Constitution itself be changed to meet challenges and issues which arise. The Committee has reservations if judicial interpretation and intergovernmental agreements become the primary means of resolving constitutional issues as these avenues remove public engagement, certainty of interpretation and transparency of process. For these reasons, formal change of the Constitution should remain a viable mechanism for resolving issues.”*

The Committee further commented:

*“4.47 In relation to federalism and issues of transparency and accountability, the Committee recommended:*

- *the circulation of draft intergovernmental agreements for public scrutiny and comment;*
- *the parliamentary scrutiny of draft intergovernmental agreements; and*
- *the augmentation of the COAG register of intergovernmental agreements so as to include all agreements requiring legislative implementation with a view to the implementation of these reforms throughout the jurisdictions.”*

Unsurprisingly though, [when the government responded to the Report in May 2010](#), there was no enthusiasm for public scrutiny:

*“The Committee's single recommendation is that intergovernmental agreements be automatically referred to a parliamentary committee for scrutiny and report to the Parliament. The Government agrees that there is reason to consider questions of transparency and accountability in relation to intergovernmental agreements. While such agreements may not be legally enforceable, they can be important to a complete understanding of intergovernmental arrangements. There is an argument that Australians should have access to agreements in appropriate cases. The Government will consider these issues as part of its broader consideration of federal arrangements. The Government does not accept, however, that a one-size-fits-all approach is likely to be appropriate. In particular, the Government is not persuaded that automatic referral of intergovernmental agreements to a parliamentary committee is generally appropriate. Agreements between executive governments are political in nature and necessarily reflect practical compromises. They often involve wide-ranging and continuing negotiation, where flexibility is essential. The Australian Government is ultimately accountable to the Commonwealth Parliament, and through the Parliament to the Australian people, for the agreements it makes.”*

In an address to the Kenya National Judicial Colloquium on Environmental Law, 10-13 January 2006 entitled [“The Role of the Judiciary in Promoting Sustainable Development: The Experience of Asia and the Pacific”](#), Chief Judge of the Land and Environment Court of New South Wales, Justice Brian Preston details the history of sustainable development and Agenda 21, which was agreed to at the [United Nations Conference on Environment and Development \(UNCED\)](#) in 1992, and their inclusion in Australian laws through two guiding documents, the [Intergovernmental Agreement on the Environment](#), and the [National Strategy for Ecologically Sustainable Development](#).

According to Chris McGrath in [“Does environmental law work?”](#):

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



*through enactment of legislation such as the Environmental Protection Act 1994 (Qld) and entrenched sustainable development as the overarching objective of the environmental legal system. The objective of sustainable development, in a variety of forms, is now the stated objective of modern environmental laws in Australia.”*

## **2. Enforcement by Global Pressure from Governments & NGO’s**

Secondly, a sense of international moral obligation, or economic pressures, is used to ensure compliance ([1](#), [2](#), [3](#), [4](#), [5](#), [6](#), [7](#), [8](#)). In this respect, [Chapter 27 of Agenda 21](#) requires governments to empower and legitimise non-state actors or NGO’s so they in turn may apply public pressure to more effectively reform environmental governance. According to [Tim Cadman and Tek Maraseni](#):

*“Another positive outcome, and enshrined in substantive document of the event, Agenda 21, was the recognition given to the participation of non-state interests, particularly non-governmental organisations (NGOs) in the framework of international environmental policy and environmental decision making at all levels (United Nations 1993). The historical precedents set by Rio have engendered a conceptual evolution away from talking almost exclusively about government (“control exercised by the nation-state, through formal (usually elected) parties”) towards governance (“control exercised by a variety of public and private institutions that have been established at different spatial scales”).”*

Although [NGOs are unelected and unaccountable](#) to the wider community, with [an ever increasing influence](#) upon government, [global NGO’s are seen by some as the pathway to global governance](#):

*“It is argued that the nature of international power in a globalizing world requires a redefinition of democracy that is more expansive than the traditional notion of electoral representative democracy. Within this context, non-state actors can play important roles in democratizing global governance because they can potentially represent a range of interests in ways that transcend national boundaries”*

[Rio Principle 10](#) required governments to fully inform NGO’s about local environmental details and empower them to take legal action against government if deemed necessary, this Principle now being [incorporated into domestic laws in more than 120 countries](#). In Australia Principle 10 was incorporated by the Howard government into [Section 487 of the EPBC Act](#). By 2015 however, the government sought to repeal this section of the Act because, according to [Attorney General George Brandis](#), *“Section 487 of the EPBC Act provides a red carpet for radical activists who have a political, but not a legal interest, in a development to use aggressive litigation tactics to disrupt and sabotage important projects.”* [Environment Minister Greg Hunt agreed describing Section 487 as](#):

*“the explicit Americanisation of environmental campaigning with its focus on tying up projects in legal challenges where the goal is not to win, but to disrupt and delay”*

Neither George Brandis or Greg Hunt mentioned the fact that Section 487 of the EPBC Act was John Howard’s attempt to undemocratically enforce Rio Principle 10 within Australia. Neither did they make clear the real reason Section 487 must now be repealed. The current government is seeking to introduce the TPP.

The TPP includes [Investor State Dispute Settlement \(ISDS\)](#) provisions to enable foreign corporations to sue governments in a [closed shop tribunal system](#) ([65](#), [66](#), [67](#), [68](#), [69](#), [70](#), [71](#)). By permitting foreign corporations to control elected governments, national sovereignty, democracy and our national judicial system, are progressively subverted and surrendered to corporate rule and global governance ([72](#), [73](#), [74](#), [75](#)). [As is noted by Buxton and colleagues in their extensive report](#), ISDS investment lawyers actively “push” corporations to pursue arbitration. The UN has warned [that ISDS poses a threat to the new international order](#), and must be banned (see document [A/70/285](#)).

ISDS will transfer legal power to foreign corporations to [enable them to Sue Australia](#) for any loss due to investments in this country which are blocked by environmentalists under Section 487. The government simply cannot afford to be sued for billions of dollars because of Rio Principle 10.

### **3. Agenda 21 Agreement Includes Reporting Requirement**

Thirdly, in the case of Agenda 21, a central part of the agreement was a reporting requirement which required the Commonwealth to periodically submit detailed compliance reports to the UN Commission for Sustainable Development (UN CSD), an organisation specifically set up to oversee the implementation of Agenda 21 ([1](#), [2](#), [3](#), [4](#), [5](#), [6](#), [7](#), [8](#)). These reports, overseen by both the UN and other countries, were very detailed, requiring input from all 3 levels of government. Australia was a driving force behind the establishment of the CSD. This type of reporting requirement is a common method the UN uses to ensure compliance ([11](#), [17](#), [18](#)).

### **4. Use of External Affairs Powers**

Fourthly, when a sufficient number of countries sign an agreement it is then considered an 'international agreement' by the Commonwealth which is then permitted, by use of the external affairs powers under the Constitution, to enshrine the provisions of the UN agreement into Commonwealth laws ([12](#), [13](#), [14](#), [15](#), [16](#), [19](#), [20](#), [21](#), [22](#), [23](#), [24](#)) This of course, then has a flow on effect, to State laws, and ultimately, Councils. Some examples of legislation based upon or including the principles of AG21/ESD include ([25](#), [26](#)):

- *the Commonwealth Agricultural and Veterinary Chemicals Act 1994, the amended Commonwealth Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Act 1975, the Commonwealth National Environment Protection Council Act 1994 (and complementary legislation in other jurisdictions);*
- [Commonwealth Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999 \(EPBC Act\)](#)
- [Wetlands policy and the Ramsar Convention](#)
- *new or amended fisheries legislation and environment protection legislation in the States and Territories; and*
- *jurisdictions which have included ESD in legislation which is not principally focussed on the environment,*
  - *- in New South Wales for instance, this includes the Environmental Planning and Assessment Regulation 1994, the State Owned Corporations Amendment Act 1995 the Water Board (Corporatisation) Act 1994 and the Electricity Legislation Amendment Act 1995, and*
  - *- while in Queensland it includes the Land Act (commenced in July 1995), amendments to the Mineral Resources Act - proclaimed on 1 May 1995 and the Planning, Environment and Development Assessment (PEDA) Bill which is presently out for comment*

#### [Julia Patrick summarises the disastrous affects of the EPBC Act:](#)

*"The Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act (EPBC Act) brought in by the then Environment Minister, Robert Hill, in 1999, has become a pernicious piece of legislation that is slowly shackling Australia. Along with its enthusiastic handmaiden, the 2003 Native Vegetation Act, it has grossly expanded its dominion, giving the environment movement carte blanche to canter off, hugely funded, to the detriment of a productive Australia....."*

*The precautionary principle in the EPBC Act is called up shamelessly: if a project is considered likely to have a detrimental impact on the environment, those responsible are in big trouble. Land clearing deemed likely to have "significant impact" on the red-tailed black cockatoo cost the company*

involved \$242,500.

*The Earth Summit brought the environmental heavies into our lives, their followers infiltrating the bureaucracies and government, including local government. Clever marketing captures the well-intentioned but gullible and those who scent the money trail.*

*Now, under the smokescreen of protecting the environment, the ever-increasing reach of the EPBC Act gives those who find the present Australia distasteful the opportunity and means to remake Australia as a socialist state. It is sabotage from within."*

## **5. Ultimate Aim is Binding Global Law**

Finally, since UN agreements are commonly considered a stepping stone to binding international laws, this becomes the ultimate step in enforcement. It is very much an ongoing process, as has been noted by Yvette Jackson in "[\*Evolutionary Spiral in the Development of Environmental Ethics\*](#)":

*"The 'blueprint' for building environmental ethics during the decade was Agenda 21 which advocated 'global consensus and political commitment' to solve environmental problems through international co-operation (including governments of developing nations) and community participation.....As international enforcement became more effective, nation-states recognising their treaty obligations would be stringently monitored, enacted domestic legislation or 'local Agenda 21s' to reflect their global obligations. To further encourage compliance with international environmental agreements, effective veto power to bring them into force was vested in developing nations. To prevent the exercise of any such veto, the developing nation was provided with certain ecologically sound economic incentives.....A new environmental ethic has evolved, reflecting acknowledgement of our obligations and responsibilities as humans to other species, and our abandonment of previously anthropocentric conceptions of ethics. It espouses biocentric ethics, to satisfy inter-generational and global distributive justice.....A significant contribution of this holistic environmental ethic is that it has shaped global environmental law and policy, prompting 'global governance' to become more transparent in its dealings and broader in its jurisdiction in that it has encouraged participation of different non-governmental parties and promoted the integration of environmental issues with social, economic, cultural and political interests."*

**In answer to the question, in Australia, various provisions of Agenda 21 have already been enshrined into Commonwealth, State, and Council, laws and regulations and are therefore legally enforceable.** Agenda 21 per se though (ie in totality), strictly speaking remains legally unenforceable until it becomes enshrined in international law, although considerable international pressure may still be used to ensure compliance. **It is certainly NOT true to say though, that the provisions of AG21 are 'non-binding' or voluntary, as many are now statutory laws within Australia.**

## **But isn't Agenda 21 an old 'dead' agreement from 20 years ago?**

No, it is not an old 'dead' agreement. It is an agreement which is being kept very much alive by all three levels of government in Australia. Although it was introduced to the Commonwealth parliament way back in 1992, successive governments and Councils have been undemocratically implementing it ever since ([1](#), [2](#), [3](#), [4](#), [5](#), [6](#), [7](#), [8](#)). The Commonwealth considered AG21 of such importance that their commitment to this UN program was renewed in 2012 at the [Rio +20 Conference](#) which was [attended by then Prime Minister Julia Gillard](#). Details of that commitment were recorded in the outcomes document from Rio +20 entitled, [The Future We Want](#)":

*"We, the heads of State and Government and high level representatives, having met at Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, from 20-22 June 2012, with full participation of civil society, renew our commitment to sustainable development, and to ensure the promotion of economically, socially and environmentally sustainable future for our planet and for present and future*

*generations.....We reaffirm our commitment to fully implement the Rio Declaration on Environment and Development, Agenda 21, the Programme for the Further Implementation of Agenda 21, the Plan of Implementation of the World Summit on Sustainable Development (Johannesburg Declaration on Sustainable Development and the Plan of Implementation) of the World Summit on Sustainable Development, the Barbados Programme of Action and the Mauritius Strategy for Implementation.....We recognize.....that governments have strengthened their commitment to sustainable development since the adoption of Agenda 21 through legislation and institutions, and the development and implementation of international, regional and sub-regional agreements and commitments.....We reaffirm that the means of implementation identified in Agenda 21, the Programme for the Further Implementation of Agenda 21, Johannesburg Plan of Implementation, the Monterrey Consensus of the International Conference on Financing for Development and the Doha Declaration on Financing for Development are indispensable for achieving full and effective translation of sustainable development commitments into tangible sustainable development outcomes.”*

When Australia signed up at Rio+20 courtesy of Julia Gillard, we also signed up for the next stage, the [Sustainable Development Goals \(SDG's\) and the post-2015 agenda](#) which is both a continuation of, and expansion of, Agenda 21:

*“We further recognize the importance and utility of a set of sustainable development goals (SDGs), which are based on Agenda 21 and Johannesburg Plan of Implementation, fully respect all Rio Principles, taking into account different national circumstances, capacities and priorities, are consistent with international law, build upon commitments already made, and contribute to the full implementation of the outcomes of all major Summits in the economic, social and environmental fields, including this outcome document. These goals should address and incorporate in a balanced way all three dimensions of sustainable development and their inter-linkages. They should be coherent with and integrated in the United Nations Development Agenda beyond 2015, thus contributing to the achievement of sustainable development and serving as a driver for implementation and mainstreaming of sustainable development in the United Nations system as a whole. The development of these goals should not divert focus or effort from the achievement of the Millennium Development Goals.....We also underscore that SDGs should be action-oriented, concise and easy to communicate, limited in number, aspirational, global in nature and universally applicable to all countries.....We resolve to establish an inclusive and transparent intergovernmental process on SDGs that is open to all stakeholders with a view to developing global sustainable development goals to be agreed by the United Nations General Assembly.....The process needs to be coordinated and coherent with the processes considering the post-2015 development agenda.”*

The fact that Agenda 21 is being renewed and expanded by the SDGs is [further confirmed by UNESCO](#):

*“The SDG process was initiated in 2012 by the Rio+20 Summit Outcome Document “The future we want”.....The SDGs identify challenges of mankind in thematically differentiated fields of action, following the tradition of Agenda 21 and the sectoral organization of politics at national and UN level.”*

Interestingly, [the 2030 SDG agenda was apparently the brainchild of Paula Caballero](#), working in combination with the Columbian government, but the Australian government has blindly followed. Far from being a ‘dead’ agreement, Agenda 21 is being ‘reborn’ and ‘revitalised’ and incorporated into national and sub-national laws, without the democratic approval of the people. As the [Australian government admits on their web site about CSD](#), “Australia’s commitment to Agenda 21 is reflected in a strong national response to meet our obligations under this international agreement.”

And as the Australian government also admits in their [“Road to Rio+20” fact sheet](#):

*“Australia has participated in sustainable development discussions for more than four decades. We have signed international treaties, supported regional initiatives and enacted international commitments through new laws and policies at home”*

In continuing this process of undemocratic subservience to the UN’s Agenda 21/sustainability process, [Foreign Minister Julie Bishop](#) signed Australia up for the next step [at the SDG Summit in New York in September 2015](#). Like Agenda 21, which the Australian government has been forcing Australians to comply with for 23 years, the [Australian government also describes the SDG/post-2015 process as “non-binding”](#).

**If the UN’s post-2015 process is just as ‘non-binding’ as Agenda 21, then ordinary Australians can look forward to being dragged into court to face reprehensible legal charges as the Australian government forces Australian citizens to obey the dictates of the United Nations.**

Clearly, unlike in America where there is a spreading movement to ban UN AG21 interference in domestic politics, in Australia, many politicians still pretend AG21 is ‘dead’, it is ‘voluntary’, or it only exists in the minds of those they describe as ‘conspiracy theorists’. This is in spite of the fact that Julia Gillard further committed Australia to implement and expand AG21 the [Rio +20 Conference](#) through the [SDG’s](#) & the [UN post-2015 agenda](#).

## **Who is responsible for implementing or enforcing Agenda 21 in Australia?**

As then Environment Minister Ros Kelly in the Keating government pointed out when Agenda 21 was [introduced to parliament on 26<sup>th</sup> May 1992](#), the Commonwealth is the driver of AG21, and assumes ultimate responsibility:

*“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....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. .... My department has the responsibility for the overall coordination of the domestic follow-up of agenda 21 , although other agencies will have a more direct implementation task.”*

In matters of national significance the States are required to comply with the dictates of the Commonwealth regarding international agreements, hence various provisions of Agenda 21 have become firmly entrenched in State laws. As previously mentioned, this process was further strengthened by the introduction of the [1992 Intergovernmental Agreement on the Environment \(IGAE\)](#) and the [National Strategy for Ecologically Sustainable Development \(ESD\)](#). The IGAE, which was signed by the Prime Minister, all State Premiers, and the President of the Local Government Association of Australia, enabled the Commonwealth to consolidate its environmental powers over the States and local Councils.

While the Commonwealth exerts direct control over States in the ‘national interest’, and States in turn control local Councils, the Commonwealth has also exercised more direct control over Councils by funding Agenda 21, by embedding Environmental Resource Officers in Councils or Local Government Associations, and even by producing an Agenda 21 instruction manual for Councils. As a result of these pressures, Councils around Australia have widely adopted Agenda 21/ESD programs.

## What is the role of the judiciary in AG21/ESD implementation?

The lawyers and judges of course, are at the forefront when it comes to forcing Australians to comply with the dictates of AG21/ESD, as required by the UN. But when it comes to political issues such as AG21/ESD, judges may go beyond impartiality and [become 'activists'](#).

The judiciary, responsible for penalising Australians for failing to comply with the provisions of Agenda 21, have discussed the relevant enforcing laws in various papers such as, "[Internalising Ecocentrism in Environmental Law](#)", "[The Role of the Judiciary in Promoting Sustainable Development: The Experience of Asia and the Pacific](#)", "[Ecologically Sustainable Development in the Courts in Australia and Asia](#)", "[Judicial Implementation of the Principles of Ecologically Sustainable Development in Australia and Asia](#)", "[The Rise of Environmental Law in New South Wales and Federally: Perspectives from the Past and Issues for the Future](#)", and "[Synopsis of the Queensland Environmental Legal System](#)", "[Jurisprudence on Ecologically Sustainable Development: Paul Stein's Contribution](#)", "[From Declaration to Implementation – RIO+13: An Evaluation of its Legal Significance in International Environmental Law](#)", and the *Pacific Islands judges Symposium on Environmental Law and Sustainable Development*, Brisbane, 2002.

The underlying philosophy driving Agenda 21 and the rewriting of our legal system is based upon [ecocentrism](#), or the [transferring of property rights from humans to plants, animals, or the environment](#). This is a complete reversal of traditional legal principles which were based upon [anthropocentrism](#) or human centredness. In fact, [Agenda 21 is described by Yvette Jackson](#) as representing a "biocentric philosophy" and a "'blueprint' for building environmental ethics" by a "global consensus" between governments and NGOs.

Ecocentrism, or [earth jurisprudence](#), was explained by Justice Preston in a recent speech entitled '[Internalising Ecocentrism in Environmental Law](#)':

*"Ecocentrism involves taking a nature-centred rather than a human-centred approach, where the earth is valued not as a commodity belonging to us but a community to which we belong. Development of an earth jurisprudence requires the internalisation of ecocentrism in environmental law..... An increasing recognition of the first law of ecology – that everything is connected to everything else - and that the Earth's ecosystem is, in a sense, a spaceship, may necessitate more sweeping positive obligations on landowners..... The Australian National Strategy of Ecologically Sustainable Development defines the concept as "development that improves the total quality of life, both now and in the future, in a way that maintains the ecological processes on which life depends." Statutes could enhance implementation of ESD by imposing positive obligations on landowners to achieve ESD, including by the conservation of biological diversity and ecological integrity."*

**This represents a radical revolution in legal thinking and a reversal of the fundamental values that underpin our society.** Even more radical though, is the belief that these ideas should be [permanent and unchallengeable](#), regardless of the will of the people. According to Christine Trenorden, Former Senior Judge, SA Environment Resources and Development Court, in [Judicial Review and the Principles of Ecological Sustainable Development: Where are we Going](#), ESD means non-regression of environmental laws:

*"Although the mutability of laws is an essential principle in general, our understanding of the environment and the concept of sustainable development compel new thinking: the repeal or diminution of progressive laws to protect the environment would contradict the principle of inter-generational equity;*

- *The right to a healthy environment is recognised as a human right from which there can be no derogation;*
- *A number of international environmental conventions aim to conserve, protect and improve the environment/ecosystems.....*

*.....The principle was inferentially recognised, it is argued, in the final document agreed at the Rio + 20 Summit The Future We Want. Paragraph 20 states that ‘In this regard, it is critical that we do not backtrack from our commitment to the outcome of the United Nations Conference on Environment’...*

*the following might provide arguments for non-regression:*

- *Australia is a signatory to a number of international environmental conventions that aim to protect, preserve and enhance the environment; and*
- *as a result of the incorporation of the principles of ESD into legislation many years ago Australians have an expectation that the government will continue to assess development against these principles.”*

**So not only are the traditional values which underpin our society under attack**, but further, there are moves to completely prevent any democratic reversal of these laws. And all this is being done under the banner of human rights!

## **Is Agenda 21 a bipartisan issue?**

Yes. [Agenda 21 has long been supported by both major political parties](#) and the Greens. Unlike the ALP and the Greens however, the Coalition did not declare Agenda 21 in their official policy platform even though it has long been supported by the highest levels of the Liberal Party.

## **Is Agenda 21 democratically based, were the people given an electoral choice?**

No, it is not democratically based and the people were given no choice ([1](#), [2](#), [3](#), [4](#), [5](#), [6](#), [7](#), [8](#)). As already noted, it was a bipartisan policy, so even if Agenda 21 had been openly declared as policy, the people had no choice.

## **But how is it possible for a UN program to be implemented by successive governments for 20 years without the people being given a democratic choice?**

The United Nations issued instructions that the global sustainability agenda must transcend party politics and be thoroughly embedded into the bureaucracy to prevent any threat to the continuation of the policy upon change of government. In order to achieve this, the Commonwealth put in place various (undemocratic and unconstitutional) intergovernmental bureaucratic measures, and sought to deliberately embed the sustainability agenda at all levels of the bureaucracy and the executive ([7](#)). In this way, and by bipartisanship, democracy was subverted and the people were prevented from having any democratic influence which could threaten the UN’s sustainability agenda ([7](#)).

## **Why do some politicians claim Agenda 21 is a wonderful environmental program to protect trees, reduce pollution, and even reduce poverty, and yet**

## they unanimously agree it is not a vote winner to be discussed during election campaigns?

The reasons for this are obvious from the above. While the politicians may have been proud of the **stated** aims of AG21/ESD, they were certainly NOT proud of the **true** aims, **or the deceitful anti-democratic, anti-Australian means by which this imported global program has been forced upon the Australian people** ([1](#), [2](#), [3](#), [4](#), [5](#), [6](#), [7](#), [8](#)). [The ALP have even gone so far as to suggest their official Agenda 21 policy is a 'conspiracy'](#).

## But isn't a healthy environment a fundamental human right?

Those with an obsessive undemocratic global agenda commonly seek to export control of the environment and climate to the UN. Human rights are no different.

[According to the Australian Human Rights Commission:](#)

*“key human rights standards are included in the Rio Declaration and Agenda 21, even though these standards are not referred to as rights. They include an adequate standard of living, freedom from hunger, health care and education.”*

The HRC continues to list what it describes as [“The right to a healthy environment”](#):

1. *Environmental rights include the right of access to the unspoiled natural resources that enable survival such as land, shelter, food, water and air; the right to refuse development; and specific environment-related rights of Indigenous peoples.*
2. *Environmental rights are provided for by international instruments including the Convention on Biological Diversity<sup>[9]</sup>, the Ramsar Convention, the Rio Declaration<sup>[10]</sup> and Agenda 21<sup>[11]</sup>.*
3. *The Rio Declaration asserts that human beings are at the centre of concerns for sustainable development and that we are entitled to a healthy and productive life in harmony with nature.<sup>[12]</sup> It also recognises the vital role of Indigenous communities' knowledge and traditional practices in environmental management and calls on States to recognise and duly support the identity, culture and interests of Indigenous peoples and enable their effective participation in the achievement of sustainable development.<sup>[13]</sup>*

Once again of course, these so called 'human rights' involve transferring the power to the UN to control or revoke these 'rights', at their discretion.

## How much do all 3 levels of government spend on Agenda 21 related initiatives?

In spite of repeated requests made to various politicians in an effort to ascertain the costs of Agenda 21, all have refused to respond. One difficulty of course, is that AG21 is thoroughly embedded at all levels, and in all departments, of the bureaucracy and government. Back in 1992 [Agenda 21 was predicted to cost \\$625 billion annually](#). We also know **that in the decade following the introduction of Agenda 21, Commonwealth government environmental expenditure exploded, going from \$80 million in 1992 to \$1.557 billion in 2002**. This of course does not include the incalculable amounts spent in total by State governments and local councils. And since Agenda 21 embraces cultural, social, and economic policies in addition to environmental policies, the true cost of Agenda 21 implementation is obviously many times greater. Not surprisingly, the Agenda 21 based, but



expanded 2030 SDG agenda, is [expected to cost at least \\$2-3 trillion annually](#).

## **Is Agenda 21 illegal or unconstitutional?**

Legislating to enforce the dictates of foreign organisations such as the UN within Australia is most certainly in violation of the spirit of our Constitution and our legal system. Additionally, when the people are denied a democratic choice, it also represents an attack on the foundations of democracy within Australia ([1](#), [2](#), [3](#), [4](#), [5](#), [6](#), [7](#), [8](#)).

The fact that our politicians have been able to exploit various loopholes in our system to subvert our Constitution and democratic institutions does not change these facts.

Having said this, there seems little doubt that the Commonwealth, the States, and Councils, have exceeded their Constitutional and legal authority in regard to the various mechanisms they have utilised to enforce the dictates of AG21/ESD upon the people of Australia.

Only appropriate court action can decide definitively.

## **Why do so many, including the mainstream media, prefer to pretend Agenda 21 is a conspiracy?**

Many in the media, and no doubt politicians too, really do believe AG21 is just 'conspiracy' talk. Frequently though, the term 'conspiracy theorist' is very deliberately used to [demonise and silence critics when it is considered that publicity would have extreme repercussions](#). The use of such language by those who have been involved in implementing AG21, and are aware of the undemocratic unconstitutional mechanisms which have been utilised to implement it, is clearly a means of control, denial, and continuing suppression of truth.

## **But why should I care? How will AG21/ESD affect me?**

If you, or your family, or your business, use energy and consume resources, then AG21 will affect you. If you own private property, and if you reside in a modern capitalist country like Australia, AG21 will affect you. As previously noted, the UN will decide what they consider to be [sustainable](#), as well as [unsustainable practices](#), which must either be restricted or cease completely.

Energy and resource usage will be increasingly monitored and restricted. This will result in attempts to modify behaviour by increased costs for such basics as electricity, gas, petrol, water, and usage of motor vehicles. Businesses will face increasing costs for energy use and pollution. And rights to private property will be increasingly restricted on environmental grounds, with land owners facing huge obstacles in order to develop their properties or remove vegetation. Effectively, land ownership rights will be sterilised with owners unable to make desired changes to their own properties.

Of course a huge part of this will be a massive bureaucratic system to 'educate' and monitor all Australians and enforce the requirements of the UN. Government policies have been restructured to embed sustainability into the education system and the bureaucracy, as noted by [David Ellis during the 2012 AAEE National Conference](#):

*"To propagate a culture embracing change in a 'ground-up' approach to sustainability, Federal Government policies, strategies and action plans have been developed to align with the United*

*Nations Agenda 21 plan of action. The development of “informed citizens who are able to engage with complex issues and understand the need to balance competing interests” (Dept. of the Environment and Heritage, 2007), is a desirable outcome that is hoped to be achieved by the “reorientation of education towards sustainable development” Agenda 21, Chapter 36. 1992.”*

Education, or the indoctrination of children, has been a popular tool for promoting the global UN Agenda 21 and sustainability campaign ([49](#), [50](#), [51](#), [52](#), [53](#), [54](#), [55](#), [56](#), [57](#), [58](#), [59](#), [60](#), [61](#), [62](#), [63](#), [64](#)). This battle to control the minds of our children is spearheading the campaign to reverse traditional social values based upon anthropocentrism.

The political campaign to control people through environmentalism is already well developed with carbon footprint calculators designed to analyse the environmental costs of every food you eat, every appliance you use, and every mile you drive ([27](#), [28](#), [29](#), [30](#), [31](#), [32](#), [33](#), [34](#)). These calculators will become even more complex as resource consumption is increasingly restricted by law and will be backed up by monitoring devices such as smart meters which will be connected to an international grid ([35](#), [36](#), [37](#), [38](#), [39](#), [40](#)). CSIRO is developing smart meter technology to control in house appliance use at times of peak power consumption ([41](#)). And new buildings will become more expensive as they are forced to comply with the [Green Building Guide](#). Then there is the Agenda 21 based [Green Globe Certification](#) for sustainable tourism ([42](#), [43](#), [44](#), [45](#), [46](#)). Other spin-offs from Green Globe include the government funded [Sustainable Tourism Cooperative Research Centre \(STCRC\)](#), and [Earthcheck](#) ([47](#), [48](#)). Earthcheck recently acknowledged the 20<sup>th</sup> birthday of Agenda 21 ([48](#)).

As industrial costs skyrocket because of ever increasing environmental costs, the bureaucracy will expand and Australia will be required to send increasing amounts of money and resources to the UN, and to other countries. The Australian economy, industry, and life style, will increasingly suffer.

Big brother will be increasingly watching your every activity and controlling your behaviour.

## **What is the best means of countering Agenda 21 & restoring democracy?**

The agenda driving climate change and Agenda 21 is all about global power, deceit, and denial of democracy. As a result, the 3 greatest antidotes to the agenda are national environmental ‘solutions’, genuine democracy, and increased public awareness of the true underlying agenda and long term goals. While those driving the agenda constantly speak of sustainability, they carefully and most persistently avoid any mention of democratic sustainability, or means by which democracy and national sovereignty may be strengthened.

A proactive agenda, aimed at empowering democracy by ensuring the public are correctly and fully informed, and the strengthening of national sovereignty, is urgently needed. **One of the most urgent priorities of human rights organisations should be the universal application of the right to make an informed vote from genuine alternatives. This includes the right to be correctly and fully informed, the right to genuine choice as distinct from a vote for one party states or bipartisanship, and the right to remedial action if there is a breach of these rights.**

While Australia faces very real environmental problems, these should be addressed democratically by the Australian people. They should not be exaggerated and exploited by foreign agencies for political or financial gain.