

# Agenda 21 - The Covenant confirmed with Many for 1 Shabua

 [sightedmoon.com/agenda-21-the-covenant-confirmed-with-many-for-1-shabua-dan-927/](http://sightedmoon.com/agenda-21-the-covenant-confirmed-with-many-for-1-shabua-dan-927/)

By Joseph F. Dumond

March 21, 2012

## News Letter 5847-053

**27th day of the 12th month 5847 years after the creation of Adam**  
**The 12th Month in the Second year of the third Sabbatical Cycle**  
**The Third Sabbatical Cycle of the 119th Jubilee Cycle**  
**The Sabbatical Cycle of Earthquakes Famines, and Pestilences**

March 21, 2012

Shalom Brethren I am sending this Newsletter out early so that the Newer Brethren can be aware of what is going and when. This will be the last News Letter for this current year.

IN the news this past month has been the relationship between the US and Israel. President Obama has claimed to be a friend of Israel in public but then behind the scenes he has not been so friendly or helpful.

Here are a couple of reports to bare in mind as we draw closer to the upcoming war with the Muslim nations.

YNet News reported:

White House tells Sunday Times Obama pressed Netanyahu to postpone Israeli attack on Iranian nuclear facilities until after November, adding president 'might visit Israel in summer' Israel will only strike Iranian nuclear facilities in September or after the United States presidential elections in November, a White House official told the British Sunday Times newspaper after a meeting between Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu and US President Barack Obama last week.

According to the report, Obama has taken Israel's warnings about a possible strike in Iran very seriously. The Washington source added that the president "might visit in the summer to reassure the Israelis that the US commitment to defend Israel is unshakable and thus thwart a possible autumn attack."

Obama insisted that any attack on Iran should be postponed until after the US presidential elections in November, possibly even until next spring. The source revealed that Netanyahu consented to delaying a strike, but wished to know until when. "The question is how much time," he reportedly said.

The White House source added that Netanyahu presented a number of demands Iran must fulfill in order to avoid an Israeli attack, including transferring 150 kilograms (330 pounds) of

enriched uranium to a third party, stopping the enrichment process at the Fordow site near Qom and ceasing any further enrichment beyond the 3.5% required for power generation.

President Obama spoke at the AIPAC and repeatedly said to Israel that the USA had Israel's back.

We can read about how in truth the President has not had Israel's back since he came to office.

Why Israel Still Can't Trust That Obama Has Its Back

**<http://www.tnr.com/article/world/101440/obama-netanyahu-israel-iran-aipac-foreignpolicy>**

I then would like to urge you all to listen to Prime Minister Netanyahu in his speech at these same AIPAC meetings.

Netanyahu's speech on March 5, 2012.

**[http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=1GnDbA5r0pc&feature=player\\_embedded](http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=1GnDbA5r0pc&feature=player_embedded)**

If you have heard the presentation I teach you about the oil situation and how it is going to be the thing that ignites this coming war in which Israel is going to be invaded by the King of the North; then listen to what Prime Minister Netanyahu has to say about the Suez being cut off.

This is also so you know what is going on in the world right now. How close we are to things going ballistic.

The Prophecies of Abraham have been showing us that things are about to happen. 2012 matches up to the year 586 BC in which Judah fell to the Babylonians.

2013 matches up to the time in Abraham's life cycle when The Kings of the North invaded Sodom and Gomorrah. Jerusalem is known in prophecy as Sodom and Gomorrah. 2013 is also the point which many believe to be the beginning of the last 3 ½ years of tribulation; A deception by Satan but a reality that most of the Christians and Messianics believe none the same.

We are near to something huge.

Also in the news this week has been more about Sudan.

**<http://barenakedislam.com/2012/03/18/no-matter-what-you-think-of-george-clooneyunlike-barack-obama-he-is-trying-to-help-the-mainly-black-christian-people-of-sudan/>**

One of the things that I have been teaching is that 1996, the first year of this the last Jubilee cycle, was also the year that the covenant was to be made between the Beast Power and the many other nations as we are told in Daniel.

Dan 9:27 "And he shall confirm a covenant with many for one week.

The Word for week is;

H7620 ?????? ?????? ?????? sha?bu?a? sha?bu?a? shebu??a?h shaw-boo'-ah, shaw-boo'-ah, sheb-oo-aw'

Properly passive participle of H7650 as a denominative of H7651; literally sevened, that is, a week (specifically of years): – seven, week.

This is the last Shabua. A shabua is a 49 year Jubilee cycle and this is the last 49 year period which began in 1996 and goes to 2044 the 49th year in this Jubilee cycle. 2045 is the beginning of the 7th millennium.

In Daniel we are told of this covenant. But for years I have not been able to learn what this covenant is. That was until this past Shabbat when Lora Skeahan found it and shared it with us. I thank her for her diligent research and hard work to learn this and share it with us.

Here is the synopsis of what this covenant says which 179 of our nations have already signed and agreed to and are already implementing. What began as suggestions and was voluntary is now becoming law and is punishable by those who wrote it upon those who do not agree to it. North America has signed away it's liberty and freedom and no one even knows it.

<http://sovereignty.net/p/sd/covenant.htm>

### **New Treaty In the Making Covenant on Environment and Development**

(from eco-logic January/February, 1998)

Few people in America have seen Agenda 21. Even fewer have read it. It is a 288-page document, consisting of 40 chapters replete with "recommendations" that affect virtually every aspect of human life. Taken together, the recommendations, when fully implemented, constitute what is called "sustainable development." Agenda 21 is the Action Plan adopted at UNCED — the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development — in Rio de Janeiro in 1992. The United States was one of 179 nations that signed the document. It is a "soft-law document," meaning that it is not legally binding, and therefore, Congress has no reason to review or approve its content. Nevertheless, the recommendations contained in Agenda 21 are being implemented through two separate, but coordinated, initiatives: the President's Council on Sustainable Development (PCSD), and the International Council for Local Environmental Initiatives (ICLEI). Implementation is occurring through the promulgation of rules by federal agencies, and through the development of plans for "sustainable communities" at the local level. Recommendations from Agenda 21 are being implemented without the benefit of public debate by elected officials. Though many communities do not recognize it as such, a well-coordinated national effort is underway to transform America to conform to the principles set forth in Agenda 21.

Although Agenda 21 is a soft-law document, it was, from the start, intended to be the precursor of an all-encompassing UN Treaty. The most recent iteration of that treaty has now been obtained and reviewed. It is called, in its present form, "Draft International Covenant on Environment and Development." It is organized into 11 parts, containing a total of 72 Articles.

It will convert the “soft-law” recommendations of Agenda 21, into legally binding “hard” international law.

Before examining the document itself, it is helpful to realize that the procedure for making international law has evolved since 1948 and is now recognized by the international community as the norm. The introduction to the Draft Covenant says:

“The progression of legal principles from recommendatory ‘soft’ to legally clear ‘hard’ is well known in international law. For example, the 1948 Universal Declaration of Human Rights, a ‘soft law’ instrument, was the precursor to the two 1966 UN Covenants on Human Rights.”

Similarly, the Vienna Convention on Ozone Depleting Substances was adopted and ratified as a treaty which required only that nations “monitor” substances thought to be ozone-depleting. The Conference of the Parties, then adopted the Montreal Protocol which made the treaty legally binding. The same process is being used to convert the “voluntary” Framework Convention on Climate Change into a legally binding “hard law” document through the Kyoto Protocol. The Covenant on Environment and Development is following the same path.

The first call for an international treaty on environment and development came from the 1983 World Commission on Environment and Development, also known as the “Brundtland Commission.” Their final report, published in 1987, entitled *Our Common Future*, recommended that the United Nations prepare

“a new and legally-binding universal Convention [which] should consolidate existing and establish new legal principles, and set out the associated rights and responsibilities of States individually and collectively for securing environmental protection and sustainable development to the year 2000 and beyond.”

The International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN) assembled a working group under its Commission on Environmental Law (CEL), under the chairmanship of Dr. Wolfgang E. Burhenne, in November, 1989. They produced a draft text containing 88 provisions. A second meeting of the IUCN group met in March 1991, under the chairmanship of Dr. Parvez Hassan. The Draft Covenant was translated into six official languages recognized by the UN and provided to PrepComm Working Group III, then preparing for UNCED in Rio. The evolving Covenant then became the basis for the development of Agenda 21.

From the start, Agenda 21 was intended to be a “soft law” document. Therefore, its ideas are presented in the form of recommendations with no discussion at all of compliance and enforcement. The Draft Covenant, however, does address those issues. A third meeting of the IUCN group was held shortly after UNCED to incorporate ideas presented in Rio into the Covenant. Two more meetings occurred, in April and September 1993. Both the Chairs of the IUCN’s Ethics Commission and the IUCN’s Species Survival Commission were invited to participate. The drafting committee met again in April, and September 1994. While the IUCN is clearly the driving force behind the document, other organizations that participated in the development of the Covenant included the International Council of Environmental Law (ICEL);

and the United Nations Environmental Programme's Environmental Law and Institutions Programme Activity Center (UNEP/ELIPAC).

The current Draft Covenant was completed March 1995, in Bonn, Germany.

Like all recent UN Treaties, the language is somewhat vague and seeks to establish principles which may be interpreted in the future by the treaty's Conference of the Parties. Part I, Article 1 sets forth the Covenant's objective:

"The objective of this Covenant is to achieve environmental conservation and sustainable development by establishing integrated rights and obligations."

The casual reader might miss the import of this Article: "...by establishing integrated rights and obligations." This Article clearly illustrates the difference between the UN's concept of governance and America's concept of governance. America recognizes that humans have certain "inalienable" rights, among which is the right to create a government controlled by the people who are governed through representatives who are elected by the people who are governed. Inalienable rights are limited; obligations are accepted in America only with the consent of the people who are governed. The People who are governed retain the right to cast off any limitation on their rights or any obligation they may have previously accepted, simply by electing a new batch of representatives.

The Covenant, on the other hand, assumes that "rights" are granted by government, and that people to whom rights are granted "owe" certain obligations to government as may be prescribed by government. This concept of governance is the prevailing view held by most of the world. The American view is beyond the comprehension of most of the world's peoples. Even in nations that are described as "social democracies," it is assumed that government is the source of human rights. This is an exceedingly important principle of governance that America has failed to advance in the international community. In fact, the UN's concept of governance is eroding the traditional American view of governance every time America embraces a UN treaty. The President's Council on Sustainable Development, too, is operating on the UN principle, by-passing Congress and other elected officials, as it implements the recommendations of Agenda 21.

Part II of the Covenant includes Articles 2 through 10 which set forth the primary principles on which the Covenant is based. Most of the principles are at odds with traditional American values. For example, Article 2 declares that:

"Nature as a whole warrants respect; every form of life is unique and is to be safeguarded independent of its value to humanity."

This principle replaces the anthropocentric world view with a biocentric world view. Historically, Americans have believed that human life is the supreme value aside from the creator of all life; that human beings are at the top of the food chain. Americans have believed that human beings are creation's crowning jewel, that, ultimately, all species (natural resources) are available for human use. The biocentric world view holds that humans have no value greater

than any other species and that all species — including humans — have equal rights. This biocentric view has been officially adopted by the U.S. Department of Interior, which, in its Ecosystem Management Policy, states that “in all ecosystem management activity, human beings shall be considered as a biological resource.”

The “Precautionary Principle” is codified in Article 7. The same idea is expressed in Principle 15 of Agenda 21. It is the idea that policy action should not wait on scientific justification if “government” decides that a “threat” to the environment exists. Article 8 (Principle 3 in Agenda 21) declares that the “right” to development is accompanied by the “obligation” to meet environmental and “equity” needs — as determined by non-elected government policy makers. Article 10 writes into international law “The elimination of unsustainable patterns of production and consumption...” again, as determined by non-elected government policy makers. Maurice Strong, Secretary-General of UNCED, and now, Executive Coordinator of UN Reform, declared in Rio that single family homes, air conditioning, and automobiles — are not sustainable.

Part III sets forth the general obligations. Article 11 declares that “States have, in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations and the principles of international law, the sovereign right to utilize their resources....” This article clearly establishes the United Nations Charter and the “principles of international law” as superior to national sovereignty. Moreover, the Article also sets forth specific “obligations” which include the obligation to “protect and preserve the environment.”

Article 12 describes the obligations of individuals: “All persons have a duty to protect and preserve the environment.” Article 13 requires “Parties shall pursue sustainable development policies aimed at the eradication of poverty...[and] the conservation of biological diversity.”

Part IV (Articles 16 through 22) says States “shall restrict human activities which modify, or are likely to modify...” stratospheric ozone, global climate, the soil, water, natural systems, biological diversity, and cultural and natural heritage. Part V, in three Articles, deals with measures to prevent environmental harm, pollution, waste generation, and the introduction of “alien” organisms.

Part VI deals with global issues. Article 27 focuses on “demographic” policies. Each state Party is required to “provide to their populations full information on the options concerning family planning.” Article 28 requires “strategies to reduce or eliminate unsustainable patterns of consumption.” Article 29 requires the eradication of poverty and “food security.” Article 30 requires pricing of raw materials and commodities to “reflect the full direct and indirect social and environmental costs of their extraction, production, transport, marketing, and disposal.”

### Responsibility and Liability

The Covenant is quite comprehensive. It writes into “hard” international law virtually all of the recommendations of Agenda 21, and many new ideas. Part IX deals with “Responsibility and Liability.” The following articles speak for themselves.

#### Article 47 – State Responsibility

“Each State Party is responsible under international law for the breach of its obligations under this Covenant or of other rules of international law concerning the environment.”

#### Article 48 – State Liability

“Each State Party is liable for significant harm to the environment of other States or of areas beyond the limits of national jurisdiction, as well as for injury to persons resulting therefrom, caused by acts or omissions of its organs or by activities under its jurisdiction or control.”

#### Article 49 – Cessation, Restitution and Compensation

“Each State Party shall cease activities causing significant harm to the environment.... Where that is not possible, the State Party of the origin of the harm shall provide compensation or other remedy for the harm.”

#### Article 50 – Consequences of Failure to Prevent Harm

“Each State Party may be held responsible for significant harm to the environment resulting from its failure to carry out the obligations of prevention contained in this Covenant, in respect to its activities or those of its nationals.”

#### Article 52 – Civil Remedies

“Parties shall ensure the availability of effective civil remedies that provide for cessation of harmful activities as well as for compensation to victims of environmental harm irrespective of the nationality or the domicile of the victims.”

#### Article 53 – Recourse under Domestic Law and Non-Discrimination

“Each State Party of origin shall ensure that any person in another State Party who is adversely affected by transboundary environmental harm has the right of access to administrative and judicial procedures equal to that afforded nationals or residents of the State Party of origin in cases of domestic environmental harm.”

#### Article 54 – Sovereign Immunity

“Parties may not claim sovereign immunity in respect of proceedings instituted under this Covenant.”

#### Article 55 – Beyond National Jurisdiction

“The provisions of Articles 47 to 54 may be invoked by any affected person for harm to the environment of areas beyond national jurisdiction.”

Disputes arising from the Covenant are to be settled either by an arbitral tribunal, the

Permanent Court of Arbitration, the International Court of Justice, and the International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea. As has become the custom of UN Treaties, Article 69 provides that “No reservations may be made to this Covenant.”

This is the UN Treaty that will move the world into the clutches of global governance. All the other “soft law” documents and specific purpose treaties are simply steps toward global governance. The Covenant on Environment and Development clearly identifies the destination to which all the other documents are leading. Our State Department is fully aware of this Covenant, and the other activities of the IUCN which has developed this Covenant. In fact, the U.S. State Department contributes more than \$1 million per year to the IUCN, a nongovernmental organization (NGO), that coordinates the activity of more than 700 other NGOs toward the development and implementation of global governance.

It is not yet known when the UN intends to roll-out this Covenant for public consideration. The Millennium celebration planned for the year 2000, during which the first meeting of the new “Assembly of the People” will meet, could be the occasion. The Assembly of the People will consist of selected representatives from NGOs that are “accredited” by the United Nations. Global governance is not an event that will occur on a day certain in the future. It is a process that has been underway for several years and will become a fact before most Americans realize that it is a threat.

In the above document we just read the following line;

Nevertheless, the recommendations contained in Agenda 21 are being implemented through two separate, but coordinated, initiatives: the President’s Council on Sustainable Development (PCSD), and the International Council for Local Environmental Initiatives (ICLEI).

You can look up what the ICLEI is doing in your respective state at the following link in the USA. <http://www.icleiusa.org/main-page/about-iclei/members/member-list>

If you are in Canada here is the link for your communities that have signed up with the beast power; <http://www.iclei.org/index.php?id=611>

And here is the link to the international community that are joining this union where they give up their freedoms to this group in the European Union who are turning this voluntary laws or soft laws into hard laws with penalties and the loss of freedoms; <http://www.iclei.org/>

And here is some more for you to read about this invasive law that your country has now signed up for.

And as you read consider this scripture about the Beasts of Daniels prophecy.

Dan 7:7 “After this I looked in the night visions and saw a fourth beast, fearsome and burly, exceedingly strong. And it had great iron teeth. It devoured and crushed, and trampled down the rest with its feet. And it was different from all the beasts that were before it, and it had ten horns.



Here is one of the steps that was taken in Rio in 1992 that then led to the one passed in 1996.  
<http://www.un.org/esa/dsd/agenda21/index.shtml>

In revelation is a strange scripture that I want you to read especially after reading this Agenda 21 treaty. It is telling us that even in war they will be concerned with the trees as they kill each other.

Rev 9:1 And the fifth messenger sounded, and I saw a star from the heaven which had fallen to the earth. And the key to the pit of the deep was given to it.

Rev 9:2 And he opened the pit of the deep, and smoke went up out of the pit like the smoke of a great furnace. And the sun was darkened, also the air, because of the smoke of the pit.

Rev 9:3 And out of the smoke locusts came upon the earth, and authority was given to them as the scorpions of the earth possess authority.

Rev 9:4 And it was said to them that they shall not harm the grass of the earth, or any green matter, or any tree, but only those men who do not have the seal of Elohim upon their foreheads.

Rev 9:5 And it was given to them that they should not kill them, but to torture them for five months. And their torture was like the torture of a scorpion when it stings a man.

Even in all of this coming mayhem the armies of Satan are told to protect the grass and all trees and anything green. This has been so strange to me to read until now when I see this agenda 21. It is becoming clearer each day.

In order to protect the environment these laws will be enforced on those nations who break them. And even in the time of war the armies are going to have to abide by this same safe the trees campaign.

Brethren you have now read the covenant that is made with many for this the last Shabua which began in 1996. It was signed in Germany and is to protect the environment at all cost, even if that cost is war. What was a soft law is now becoming a hard and fast law and more are coming as more time passes.

See again this other article about this Agenda 21.

[http://www.crossroad.to/text/articles/la21\\_198.html](http://www.crossroad.to/text/articles/la21_198.html)

Agenda 21

The U.N. Plan for Your "Sustainable" Community

By Berit Kjos – 1998

Note: This global contract binds all nations to the collective vision of "sustainable development." They must commit to pursue the three E's of "sustainability": Environment, Economy and Equity referring to the UN blueprint for environmental regulations, economic manipulation, and social equity. (See also Habitat 2)

The Local Agenda 21 Planning Guide — a UN manual for global transformation (which I brought home from the 1996 UN Conference on Human Settlements in Istanbul) was prepared by The International Council for Local Environmental Initiatives (ICLEI). Community leaders around the world are now called to implement a new “Communitarian” system of governance which overrides our constitutional rights and freedoms.

“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. Public control of land use is therefore indispensable....” (Item #10 in the UN agenda at the 1976 Habitat 1. American delegates supported this policy)

These three updates illustrate United Nations’ “progress” toward implementation of its Marxist agenda:

1. The United Nations bans opposition to its Global Tax Design. “When United Nations Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon announced his plan ‘to fundamentally transform the global economy — based on low-carbon, clean energy resources,’ few realized he was calling for a new global tax to be designed without public scrutiny.... The UN’s one nation, one vote system has been used since its founding to render the U.S. impotent, regardless of the fact that we are its major financial donor. ....Banning the press and global tax opponents from its July 13-14 tax design meeting in Tokyo, Japan, for example, is anathema to a democratic process, but the UN is not a democracy. Rather, it’s unelected bureaucrats use a ‘collaborative decision making process’ to reach ‘consensus’ with no debate or expressed opposition.....

“The purpose of the Fund is to enable the UN to implement its global blueprint for sustainable development called Agenda 21. This green agenda is the new Marxism that requires government ensured economic equity.... In the U.S., federal and state legislatures were bypassed when then-President Clinton signed an executive order to create the President’s Council on Sustainable Development to implement Agenda 21. Federal grants continue to flow to local governments to carry out the UN’s green agenda across America.

“Granting the UN the right to tax would be like giving it a blank check for future use. Taxpayers can be assured of perpetual demand because it has no idea what it will cost to ‘go green.’ Two years ago, it estimated the cost at \$600 billion annually for the next decade, but today its estimate is at least \$1.9 trillion annually for the next 40 years or \$76 trillion” [By Cathie Adams, Eagle Forum International Issues Chairman]

2. The New ‘White House Rural Council’ = UN’s Agenda 21? “On June 9, 2011, President Obama signed his 86th Executive Order....E.O 13575 is designed to begin taking control over almost all aspects of the lives of 16% of the American people. [Ponder the new policies:]

Section 1. Policy. Sixteen percent of the American population lives in rural counties. Strong, sustainable rural communities are essential to winning the future and ensuring American

competitiveness in the years ahead.... The Federal Government has an important role to play in order to expand access to the capital necessary for economic growth, promote innovation, improve access to health care and education, and expand outdoor recreational activities on public lands.’

“Warning bells should have been sounding all across rural America when the phrase ‘sustainable rural communities’ came up. As we know from researching the UN plan for Sustainable Development known as Agenda 21, these are code words for the true fundamental transformation America.” But how will burdened farmers and other tax-payers pay the extra costs — especially in light of our government’s massive debt?”

3. Democrats Bury ‘Community Transformation’ Plans in Health Care Bill. [11-6-09]: “In the bill, the Affordable Health Choices Act, community transformation plans would be carried out using federal money and be overseen by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC).

The CDC would distribute the money as well as coordinate the various state, local, and ‘community’ entities responsible for carrying out the plans.

“...both state and local governments are eligible for the grants, as are ‘national networks of community-based organizations’.... The transformation plans must include ‘activities’ for all ages, beginning in public schools, which focus on eating healthy food, adequate amounts of physical activity....’Every time our friends on the other side start talking about community organizations, we usually think ACORN...”

“Be anxious for nothing, but in everything by prayer and supplication, with thanksgiving, let your requests be made known to God; and the peace of God, which surpasses all understanding, will guard your hearts and minds through Christ Jesus.” Philippians 4:6-7

“...current lifestyles and consumption patterns of the affluent middle class – involving high meat intake use of fossil fuels, appliances, home and work-place air-conditioning, and suburban housing – are not sustainable. A shift is necessary. which will require a vast strengthening of the multilateral system, including the United Nations...” [1] Maurice Strong , opening speech at the 1992 UN Conference on Environment and Development

Agenda 21, the UN blueprint for global transformation, sounds good to many well-meaning people. Drafted for the purpose of creating “sustainable societies”, it has been welcomed by nations around the world. Political, cultural, and media leaders have embraced its alluring visions of social justice and a healthy planet. They hide the lies behind its doomsday scenarios and fraudulent science. Relatively few consider the contrary facts and colossal costs.

After all, what could be wrong with preserving resources for the next generation? Why not limit consumption and reduce energy use? Why not abolish poverty and establish a global welfare system to train parents, monitor intolerance, and meet all our needs? Why not save the planet by trading cars for bikes, an open market for “self-sustaining communities,” and single dwellings for dense “human settlements” (located on transit lines) where everyone would dialogue, share common ground, and be equal?

The answer is simple. Marxist economics has never worked. Socialism produces poverty, not prosperity. Collectivism creates oppression, not freedom. Trusting environmental “scientists” who depend on government funding and must produce politically useful “information” will lead to economic and social disaster. 3

Even so, local and national leaders around the world are following the UN blueprint for global management and “sustainable communities,” and President Clinton is leading the way. A letter I received from The President’s Council on Sustainable Development states that –

“In April 1997, President Clinton asked the council to advise him on: next steps in building a new environmental management system for the 21st century... and policies that foster U.S. leadership on sustainable development internationally. The council was also charged to ensure that social equity issues are fully integrated...” (Emphasis added)

Many of our representatives are backing his plan. In a 1997 letter congratulating the Local Agenda 21 Advisory Board in Santa Cruz for completing their Action Plan, Congressman Sam Farr wrote,

“The Local Agenda 21 Action Plan not only has local significance, it also will have regional and national impacts. As you know, the President’s Council on Sustainable Development is beginning Phase III of its work with an emphasis on sustainable communities.”<sup>4</sup> (emphasis added)

This agenda may already be driving your community “development”, so be alert to the clues. Notice buzzwords such as “visioning,” “partners,” and “stakeholders.” Know how to resist the consensus process. Ask questions, but don’t always trust the answers. Remember, political activists, like self-proclaimed education “change agents”, have put expediency above integrity. As North Carolina school superintendent Jim Causby said at a 1994 international model school conference, “We have actually been given a course in how not to tell the truth. You’ve had that course in public relations where you learn to put the best spin on things.”<sup>5</sup>

To recognize and resist this unconstitutional shadow government of laws and regulations being imposed on our nation without congressional approval, take a closer look at its history and nature.

## Agenda 21

This global contract binds governments around the world to the UN plan for changing the ways we live, eat, learn, and communicate – all under the noble banner of saving the earth. Its regulations would severely limit water, electricity, and transportation – even deny human access to our most treasured wilderness areas. If implemented, it would manage and monitor all lands and people. No one would be free from the watchful eye of the new global tracking and information system

This agenda for the 21st Century was signed by 179 nations at the UN Conference on Environment and Development in Rio de Janeiro in 1992. Among other things, it called for a

Global Biodiversity Assessment of the state of the planet. Prepared by the UN Environmental Programme (UNEP), this GBA armed UN leaders with the “information” and “science” they needed to validate their global management system. Its doomsday predictions were designed to excuse radical population reduction, oppressive lifestyle regulations, and a coercive return to earth-centered religions as the basis for environmental values and self-sustaining human settlements.

The GBA concluded on page 763 that “the root causes of the loss of biodiversity are embedded in the way societies use resources.” The main culprit? Judeo-Christian values. Chapter 12.2.3 states that-

“This world view is characteristic of large scale societies, heavily dependent on resources brought from considerable distances. It is a world view that is characterized by the denial of sacred attributes in nature, a characteristic that became firmly established about 2000 years ago with the Judeo-Christian-Islamic religious traditions.

“Eastern cultures with religious traditions such as Buddhism, Jainism and Hinduism did not depart as drastically from the perspective of humans as members of a community of beings including other living and non-living elements.”<sup>6</sup>

Maurice Strong, who led the Rio conference, seems to agree. His ranch in Colorado is a gathering place for Buddhist, Bahai, Native American, and other earth-centered religions. Yet, while spearheading the restructuring of the United Nations (see “World Heritage Protection?”), he also helped design the blueprint for the transformation of our communities. And in his introduction to The Local Agenda 21 Planning Guide, he called local leaders around the world to “undertake a consultative process with their populations and achieve a consensus on ‘Local Agenda 21’ for their communities.”

Achieving that consensus meant painting scary scenarios of a hurting, dying planet that frighten children, anger youth, and persuade adults to submit to the unthinkable regulations. (See “Saving the Earth”) It means blaming climate change on human activities and ignoring the natural factors that have – throughout time – brought cyclical changes in climate, storm patterns, wildlife migration, and ozone thinning (there has never been a “hole”).