

Indoctrinating Schoolchildren to Support the United Nations Global Agenda

Children Become 'Activists' in Support of UN Climate/Sustainability Agenda

Graham Williamson
February 2019

UN Globalises Brainwashing in the 'Modern' Era of Globalisation

"In the future children will all be learning from the same script, literally. Parents will become increasingly sidelined as globalised schools take over everything from mental & dental health to sexuality & nutrition.....The UN has decreed that it will decide what children learn & what values they should have. UN leaders have boasted that children's behaviour, attitudes, beliefs, views, & even 'spirituality' will be shaped by global programs. And incredibly, national governments have gone along with it.....Instead of actually educating children, government schools in America & all over the world are being transformed into indoctrination centres..... True critical thinking is on the way out....It is about transforming human society, bringing the world together under a single system, & preparing children not just to accept tyranny - but to love it & demand it"

Alex Newman, [The New American; Feb 4th 2019, p27](#)

UN Crackdown on Private Schools

Concerned that students in private schools around the world are not receiving sufficient doses of globalist indoctrination prescribed by various global agreements, the dictator-dominated UN Human Rights Council passed a resolution in July 2015 calling on governments worldwide to 'monitor & regulate' non-government education."

Alex Newman, [The New American; Feb 4th 2019, p27](#)

UNESCO Says Teachers Are 'Change Agents' Promoting UN Global Agenda

"UNESCO has prepared this report on these key lessons in its role as 'task manager' for Chapter 36 of Agenda 21, the action plan agreed to by all governments at the Earth Summit, and the International Work Programme on Education, Public Awareness and Sustainability of the intergovernmental Commission for Sustainable Development (CSD)..... These responsibilities emphasise the key role of educators as agents of change. There are over 60 million teachers in the world - and each one is a key agent for bringing about the changes in lifestyles and systems that we need..... To be an effective change agent, the fundamental purposes of education have to change - as indicated by Agenda 21"

[Education for Sustainability - From Rio to Johannesburg: Lessons learnt from a decade of commitment](#)

*Official ALP Policy Encourages Children to Choose the Sex they Prefer

*"The right to education includes **the right for students to participate in school life as they identify** in sexuality, gender identity or varying sex characteristics..... Labor will continue to support national programs to address homophobia, biphobia, transphobia and anti-intersex prejudice in schools. **This includes ensuring gender diverse students are able to express the gender they identify with.**"*

[ALP National Platform 16-18 December 2018](#)

*Bill Shorten Supports Sexual Diversity & Queer Education of Young Children

*Bill Shorten supports "an \$8 million taxpayer funded program that aims to **teach children as young as 11 about sexual orientation and transgender issues**..... The contentious program is active in nearly 500 schools across the nation and informs students about terms such as "queer" and "pansexual.".....The teaching manual, All of Us, includes a role-playing exercise in which children as young as 11 are encouraged to imagine how it would feel to live in a same-sex relationship..... **The teaching manual also warns that asking parents if their baby is a boy or a girl reinforces a "heteronormative world view."***

Joe Kelly, ["Safe Schools: Shorten backs sexual diversity lessons", The Australian, 18/2 2016](#)

***Official ALP Policy Promises Subservience to Imported Agendas, NOT the Australian People**

*“ Labor will measure our efforts and **be accountable against internationally agreed aid and development assistance targets** and be able to report on how all of Australia’s work contributes to achievement of the SDGs, both through our international and domestic programs.....**Labor will support the Yogyakarta Principles..... in Relation to sexual orientation, gender identity, gender expression and sex characteristics”***

[ALP National Platform 16-18 December 2018](#)

***My attempts to obtain an explanation from the ALP for these policies have so far been unsuccessful.**

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Australian Educational Standards Declining as the Curriculum Becomes Increasingly Politicised & Sexualised

According to reports, Australia is now at the bottom of the list of wealthy countries when it comes to global educational standards. Evidence of political indoctrination of school students, or exploitation of children for political purposes, is extensive in Australia.

Global UN Values & ‘Dumbing Down’ of Students Replace Australian Values in Schools

Through the UN Agenda 21 agreement agreed to by the Keating government in 1993, and consolidated by the Howard, Rudd, and Gillard governments, Australian politicians have long been dedicated to destroying traditional Australian values and replacing them with imported ‘global’ values approved by the UN. Education, and our children, have been at the forefront of this anti-Australian campaign. Fear has always been a consistent tool used by the UN to achieve their goals as far as indoctrinating our children is concerned.

Australian Government Embeds Anti-Australian, Anti-Nationalist Curricular Values Under the Guise of the UNs Global Citizenship Education

Continuing this campaign of enabling UN interference in Australia, in 2015 former Foreign Minister Julie Bishop signed Australia up for the 2030 Agenda and the Sustainable Development Goals. While successive governments told Australians these UN agreements were ‘non-binding’, and therefore were of no consequence, this was untrue as governments around the world were required to legislate to enforce these ‘non-binding’ dictates of the UN. Sustainable Development Goal 4.7, signed by Julie Bishop, required that all Australian schoolchildren be educated as global citizens, not Australian citizens. Global citizens however, are a non-entity, with no one empowered to grant global citizenship. Global Citizenship Education (GCE) is essentially anti-nationalist education, it is the teaching of anti-nationalist, anti-democratic values. Yet it is endorsed by both major political parties.

Australian Government Promotes Teachers Changing from Educators to ‘Change Agents’

The 2030 Agenda agreed to by former Foreign Minister Bishop, required that Teachers become ‘change agents’, not educators. Additionally, all Australian children are required to be educated as activists promoting the UNs global sustainability agenda.

UNESCO Reinforces Change From Education to UN Driven Globalist Indoctrination

UNESCO, in their support for Agenda 21 and the 2030 Agenda, and their support for the use of teachers as change agents, has long been at the forefront of the global campaign to indoctrinate children with UN globalist values. Part of this globalist campaign involved restructuring the curriculum to ‘dumb-down’ the children so they would be more amenable. Unlike Australia, the US, under

president Donald Trump, has withdrawn from UNESCO.

United We Stand, Divided We Fall

Although most rational people and team players realise “unity is strength”, the entire philosophy of the United Nations is to divide, and celebrate ‘diversity’. Diversity, separatism, and fragmentation are of course the pathway to chaos. The entire UN philosophy though, is based upon discrimination, segregation, and dividing society into stereotyped groups, or minority groups, on the basis of ethnicity, culture, sexuality, religion etc.

This type of belief system is being used to destroy unity in society, in education and amongst our children, and even in the armed forces.

Although “unity is strength”, our politicians are doing their best to help the UN destroy that strength and cohesion, destroy the team, and destroy the team spirit. In Australia social cohesion is breaking down as minority groups are encouraged to enforce their ‘rights’ & conflict with the wider community.

Introduction

Officially, as a result of continuing government policies [Australia is progressively moving down the prosperity rankings each year](#). Indeed, this is acknowledged by the [Thriving Communities web site](#). And we have also seen that Australia is sliding down the global freedom rankings as successive governments increasingly remove or restrict freedoms in Australia. [This point has been reinforced by Foreign Minister Bishop in a recent speech](#) where she drew attention to the decline in global freedom over the past decade of globalisation. Australia of course, is also part of this trend of declining freedoms, as successive Australian governments continue working against the national interest, steadily removing or restricting freedoms we once took for granted ([1](#), [2](#), [3](#), [4](#), [5](#), [6](#)), all in pursuit of the UNs global agenda. But the same is true when it comes to educational standards. According to a report by [Pallavi Singhal](#), Australia is now at the bottom of the list of wealthy countries when it comes to global educational standards.

Evidence of political indoctrination of school students, or exploitation of children for political purposes, is extensive in Australia ([7](#), [8](#), [9](#), [10](#), [11](#), [12](#)). [According to Morrow](#):

“in too many schools and too many classrooms in this state (NSW), faddish and politicised nonsense is being passed off for education.”

Similarly, [according to Berg](#), *“The curriculum is explicit, open, and unabashed about its ideological content”*:

“the supporters of the national curriculum can no longer pretend that imposing a uniform curriculum on every single student in the country isn't an ideological undertaking.....The curriculum nominates three great themes (that is, three 'cross-curriculum priorities') which are to dominate and define Australian education for the next few decades: Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander histories and cultures, Asia and Australia's engagement with Asia, and Sustainability.”

According to experts, for more than 2 decades the aim of education has NOT simply been to educate, but rather, the intent has been to indoctrinate and produce agents of change to disseminate the UNs global agenda. Australian politicians, at the highest level, having been sabotaging Australian interests in an obsessive campaign to globalise climate, globalise education, and globalise our laws and ‘rights’, by surrendering to the dictates of the UN and encouraging undemocratic foreign interference in Australia, And they have been doing so for more than 3 decades, without giving the people a democratic vote.

The Earth Summit of 1992

The [current redesign of the school curriculum](#), especially in regard to “[cross curriculum priorities](#)” such as sustainability, has been thoroughly [embedded across all subjects](#). This was

a result of the UN's [Agenda 21 program](#), agreed to at the [Earth Summit](#), and later the [Melbourne Declaration](#) which specifically stated that "**[a focus on environmental sustainability will be integrated across the curriculum.](#)**"

In 1992, Ros Kelly, Environment Minister in the Keating government, introduced Agenda 21 to parliament and committed Australia to the [UN Agenda 21 program](#), also commonly referred to as 'ecologically sustainable development' (ESD). Under [Section 36 of Agenda 21](#), signatory countries were required by the UN to "*integrate environment and development as a crosscutting issue into education at all level*" and a "*A thorough review of curricula should be undertaken to ensure a multidisciplinary approach.*" In NSW, [Education Minister John Aquilina](#) indoctrinated schoolchildren with the UN Agenda 21 plan with the [NSW Environmental Education Policy for Schools](#)

Terrifying the Children - Using fear to further the UN global agenda

In order to obtain compliance and bring children into line with the UN agenda the use of fear was promoted as typically seen in the UN publication, "**[Rescue Mission: Planet Earth - A Children's Edition of Agenda 21](#)**", the book [being described as](#) "*an indoctrination manual design to spread fear, exaggerate concerns, and rob the innocence of our children.*"

One of the mechanisms used by the Australian government to enforce the dictates of Agenda 21 and the UN sustainability program within Australia was the [National Strategy for Ecologically Sustainable Development](#) (NSES), introduced in December 1992. Under [Chapter 26 of the NSES](#), the Australian government pledged to restructure the school curricula to support the UN sustainability agenda.

Embedding in the Curriculum

In 1997, the UN released its [Teaching and Learning for a Sustainable Future program](#), to further instruct countries on the best way of embedding the UN sustainability programme into the educational curricula. This UN programme again emphasised that sustainability must be thoroughly embedded into the curricula across 12 different subjects in a broad multidisciplinary approach. At the [World Summit on Sustainable Development \(WSSD\)](#) in Johannesburg in 2002, [attended by then Environment Minister David Kemp](#) as well as numerous other Australian representatives, including 45 from local Councils, it was confirmed again that Australian schoolchildren should be educated in line with UN sustainability objectives. And During Parliament, on 23rd September 2002, Christopher Pyne, as **[Liberal Member for Sturt, sought credit for the Howard government's Agenda 21 achievements, which of course, included educating our children in line with the dictates of the UN.](#)**

In 2005 the UN commenced its [Decade of Education for Sustainable Development](#) (DESD), which was dedicated to "*Rethinking and revising education from nursery school through university to include a clear focus on the development of knowledge, skills, perspectives and values related to sustainability.*" [The UN adopted resolution 57/254](#), "*Recalling chapter 36 of Agenda 21*", and "*emphasizing that education is an indispensable element for achieving sustainable development.*" The Resolution called for global action. The UN launched a [special web site devoted to DESD](#), and [in 2007 issued a progress report](#) to check how effectively countries around the world were re-educating children in line with UN objectives. [According to the report issued by the Director General](#), a clear 'action plan' was needed in order to effectively embed UN sustainability objectives throughout the curricula. In the Report, the UN also drew particular attention to what it referred to as the "***mainstreaming of cultural diversity***" under the umbrella of their ESD agenda.

Successive Commonwealth governments ensured the UN sustainability agenda was thoroughly embedded throughout the curriculum ([13](#), [14](#)) and [Asia-Pacific ESD indicators were developed by UNESCO](#), working with IUCN and Macquarie University. The States also cooperated with the Commonwealth to embed the UN sustainability agenda within the curricula ([15](#), [16](#), [17](#), [18](#), [19](#), [20](#), [21](#)). According to the Report by Hilary Whitehouse entitled "[Integrating Sustainability in the Australian Curriculum-Key messages for Queensland educators](#)", the Australian curriculum

was based upon the dictates of the UNs sustainability agenda. Whitehouse lists the Commonwealth's [Australian Sustainable Schools Initiative](#), [Queensland's Environmentally Sustainable Schools Initiative](#), and the [Catholic church "On Holy Ground"](#) initiative, as resulting from the [UN's DESD](#). The Commonwealth described their 2nd [National Action Plan for Education for Sustainability in 2009](#) as the "**government's response to the UNDESD.**" This government plan sought to further embed UN driven sustainability concepts into schools and universities. Not surprisingly, after a decade of political interference in the curriculum, Australian students experienced a '[decade of going backwards](#)'.

Teachers as 'Change Agents', not Educators, to Further the UN Agenda

The term 'change agent', or 'agent of change', especially in regard to political or social change, is clearly a progressive term and therefore is politically biased to the left. There is no doubt whatsoever that President Trump is a 'change agent', however many would no doubt disagree with this description in his case and hastily assert that this is not their meaning when they suggest teachers should become 'change agents'. After all, President Trump withdrew America from UNESCO, a significant change indeed!

UNESCO has described Agenda 21 as "[A Manifesto for Education](#)", and according to their report, "[Education for Sustainability - From Rio to Johannesburg: Lessons learnt from a decade of commitment](#)", **teachers primary role is as "agents of change":**

".....These responsibilities emphasise the key role of educators as agents of change. There are over 60 million teachers in the world – and each one is a key agent for bringing about the changes in lifestyles and systems that we need..... To be an effective change agent, the fundamental purposes of education have to change – as indicated by Agenda 21"

So under Agenda 21, which the Liberal Party has long endorsed ([Turnbull government voted NOT to oppose continued implementation](#)), teachers are employed as "*change agents*" on behalf of the UN. [According to UNESCO](#), the use of teachers as change agents rather than educators, is vital to the success of their global sustainability agenda:

"Educators in formal and non-formal education are vital to the implementation of the DESD and its success. The world today has more than 72 million teachers and countless numbers of non-formal educators. They are essential agents of change, working at the 'local' level but called upon to deal with 'global' issues. Teachers in primary and secondary schools around the world as well as in institutions of higher education have a significant role in creating more sustainable societies.....Teacher education institutions and teacher educators are key change agents in reorienting education to address sustainability."

Children Used as Change Agents to Further the UN Agenda

The UNs [2030 Agenda and the Sustainable Development Goals](#), signed by [former Foreign Minister Julie Bishop](#) in 2015, explicitly emphasises the role of children as change agents dedicated to the UNs global agenda:

"What we are announcing today – an Agenda for global action for the next fifteen years – is a charter for people and planet in the twenty-first century. Children and young women and men are critical agents of change and will find in the new Goals a platform to channel their infinite capacities for activism into the creation of a better world."

[Joachim von Braun suggests](#), when it comes to the UNs sustainability agenda, the role of children in society may need to change:

"Various education and science initiatives around the world have already integrated children's roles as agents of change.....Throughout history the perception and role of children have been subject to change. It may, again, be time to redefine childhood and the role of children both in today's society and for future generations."

According to [the study by Stuhmcke](#), even kindergarten children could be utilised as agents of change in pursuit of the UNs sustainability agenda:

"In this study it was found that using a transformative Project Approach encouraged children to be agents of change for sustainability. This study challenged traditional views of children and supported notions of children as competent, capable and able to enact change."

Global Citizenship Education - Allegiance to the UN, not Australia

One of the fundamental difficulties for the UN in promoting their sustainability agenda and consolidating their global power was to destroy the concept of national sovereignty and allegiance to nation states and replace it with a global mind set where the UN becomes the centrepiece. To do this they promoted global concepts such as globalism and global citizenship education. This is fundamental change represents a [shift to a 'radical' 21st century curriculum](#):

“Australian Catholic University research fellow Kevin Donnelly, a former secondary school principal who conducted the government’s 2014 review of the curriculum, said the push to elevate the role of skills and capabilities in education was a worldwide trend, driven by “globalist groupthink” “Such competencies represent a content-free approach to the curriculum that is guaranteed to further lower standards and ensure that Australian students continue to underperform and leave schools morally and culturally bereft,” Dr Donnelly said.”

[According to the ESD Toolkit](#), “World Citizenship” represents the necessary “Global Ethic for Sustainable Development”:

*"The greatest challenge facing the world community as it mobilizes to implement Agenda 21 is to release the enormous financial, technical, human and moral resources required for sustainable development. These resources will be freed up only as the peoples of the world develop a profound sense of responsibility for the fate of the planet and for the well-being of the entire human family. **"This sense of responsibility can only emerge from the acceptance of the oneness of humanity and will only be sustainable by a unifying vision of a peaceful, prosperous world society. Without such a global ethic, people will be unable to become active, constructive participants in the world-wide process of sustainable development.....World Citizenship... encompasses the constellation of principles, values, attitudes and behaviour that the people of the world must embrace if sustainable development is to be realized."***

As noted by Susan Bliss, Director of Global education in NSW, in "[Growing Global education and Globalisation in Australia](#)", undemocratic anti-nationalism themes such as global citizenship, ecocentrism, and the Gaia philosophy, are all part of the global indoctrination to which our children are subjected. In the 2006 Commonwealth report, "[Whole-School Approaches to Sustainability: A review of Models for professional development in pre-service teacher education](#)," education authorities considered a strategy for "Embedding Education for Global Citizenship and Sustainable Development in Initial Teacher Education and Training (EGCSD).

The thrust of the changes are made clear by UNESCO in "[Rethinking Schooling FOR THE 21ST CENTURY](#)":

“While ‘sustainable development’ and ‘global citizenship’ are often presented as add-ons designed to gear up schooling for the 21st century, they in fact challenge us fundamentally to rethink and redefine the purpose of education. These notions, if taken seriously, require us to make a radical departure from how education is conceptualised and organised today.....Most espouse the overwhelming or absolute priority of national interests and identities over transnational understandings. Many in turn define the nation — explicitly or implicitly — in terms of rigid ethno-cultural categories, with implications for the status of minorities and migrants, and for the accommodation of diversity.Given the still raw legacy of colonialism, imperialism and violent conflict across Asia, the prevalence of this nationalist orientation should come as no surprise, but it constitutes a considerable barrier to the realisation of SDG 4.7..... The dominance of the national lens affords little scope for students to gain a sensitive and nuanced appreciation of the tensions — often relating to environmental or economic factors — that underlie conflict within and between nations..... In UNESCO parlance, SDG 4.7 should be seen not just as one of a menu of educational ‘goals’, but as the central goal around which all others revolve..... They proposed ideas of ‘world citizenship’ which prefigure the

'global citizenship' championed today by UNESCO..... However, SDG 4.7 actually challenges us fundamentally to rethink dominant assumptions about the purposes of schooling"

[According to UN Sustainable Development Goals and Sustainable Schools-WA](#), at the behest of the UN, global citizenship education has been thoroughly embedded into the Australian curriculum:

"The Australian Curriculum has developed from its origins in the Melbourne Declaration in such a way as to encompass all the dimensions of Global Citizenship Education and Education for Sustainable Development. The common visions, aims and themes of GCEd and ESD are evident in the Cross Curriculum Priorities and General Capabilities, in particular, as well as in learning area specific knowledge, understandings and skills.."

For instance, [Geography Elective Life Skills Year 10 syllabus](#) is *"Inspired by UNESCO and their stance on Global Citizenship Education."*

[As Dr Sparrow of Monash University notes](#) (Arena Magazine, 66, August-September, 25-31) however, global citizenship means global government:

"Global citizenship means global government. But what language(s) would the affairs of this government be conducted in? Whose values would it promote? Even in a post capitalist world, would we like affairs to be decided at this level? When we think about what it actually involves, a global citizenry and a global government loses much of its appeal. But any retreat from global government acknowledges the need for borders, in some form or other."

Whether through their commitment to [UNESCO](#), [ECOSOC](#), [IPCC](#), [UNGA](#), [UNDP](#), [UNCTAD](#), [UNCITRAL](#), [UNEP](#), [UNHCR](#), [OHCHR](#), [UNFCCC](#), [UNSD](#), [IAEG](#), [UNDATAREVOLUTION](#), [UNLAW](#), [ILC](#), [GEF](#), [ESCAP](#), [UNRC](#), [CBD](#), [IACSD](#), [HLPF](#), [EarthWatch](#), [Habitat](#), [UNGlobalCompact](#), [UNGlobalPulse](#), or the [countless other UN agencies](#) and **UN agreements, Australia is firmly committed to funding and supporting the UN global agenda. These agencies, such as UNSTATS, are further divided into various subdivisions. Also, as already noted, Australia has its own UN agencies, such as the [Australian National Commission for UNESCO](#), [UNAssociation](#), [AHRC](#), [UN Global Compact](#), [UNWomen](#), [UNYouth](#), [UNAVictoria](#), and [UNGlobalCitizenshipSchools](#).**

Former Foreign Minister Julie Bishop, Global Citizenship, & Sustainable Development Goal 4.7

Educating Australian children for 'global citizenship' is one of the [Sustainable Development Goals](#) signed [by former Foreign Minister Julie Bishop](#). [Goal 4.7 states](#):

4.7 Education for sustainable development and global citizenship *By 2030, ensure that all learners acquire the knowledge and skills needed to promote sustainable development, including, among others, through education for sustainable development and sustainable lifestyles, human rights, gender equality, promotion of a culture of peace and non-violence, global citizenship and appreciation of cultural diversity and of culture's contribution to sustainable development*

In other words, all Australian school students must not only be educated as global citizens, but also must become sustainability activists for the UN cause. It is indeed odd that Australia has made no official response to this vitally important target, a target considered by [UNESCO's 2016 Global Education Monitoring Report](#) to be fundamental to SDG 4 and the SDGs. [The UN, through UNESCO, Agenda 21, and the 2030 Agenda, has been the driving force behind global citizenship education](#). Most recently, the [UN has fast tracked implementation of Julie Bishop's 2030 agenda with inclusion of the SDGs in the "school curricula of every country in the world"](#).

Former [Foreign Minister Julie Bishop indicated that she was](#) *"particularly delighted with the emphasis on learning in the Sustainable Development Goal for Education"*, and [she emphasised Australia's commitment to 'global' education and the UN's Global Education First Initiative](#):

“As a champion country for the Global Education First Initiative (GEFI), Australia is committed to increasing access to quality education and strengthening the systems necessary for effective education policy and delivery.....Australia is an active participant in multilateral fora including the Global Partnership for Education, United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC), the East Asia Summit (EAS) and the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN). Participation in dialogue and activities under the auspices of these organisations allows Australia to contribute to the post-2015 development agenda, build deeper understanding of Australia’s education system and encourage open, transparent and more effective coordination of regional education systems.”

As a result of this campaign “[universities routinely claim to produce graduates who will be global citizens](#)”, and even “[without a clear definition of good global citizenship](#)”, universities offer “[certificates in global citizenship](#)”.

[According to the UNESCO report, “Education 2030, Incheon Declaration and Framework for Action”](#), ‘robust’ monitoring will be needed to ensure compliance:

“99. Global monitoring is integral to international and regional efforts to strengthen analysis and knowledge management. In line with the UN Secretary-General’s recommendation, more efforts will be made to harmonize reporting on the SDGs with reporting to the various human rights treaty bodies that relate to education. These official national reports, often reflecting contributions by civil society, offer important insights into the status of the right to education.....

101. The EFA Global Monitoring Report will be continued in the form of the Global Education Monitoring (GEM) Report. It will be prepared by an independent team and hosted and published by UNESCO. The Director of the team is appointed by the Director-General of UNESCO. Attention will be paid to geographical balance in its Advisory Board. The GEM Report will be the mechanism for monitoring and reporting on SDG 4 and on education in the other SDGs, with due regard to the global mechanism to be established to monitor and review the implementation of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. It will also report on the implementation of national and international strategies to help hold all relevant partners to account for their commitments as part of the overall SDG follow-up and review.....

102. The collection, analysis and use of data will be further strengthened by encouraging a ‘data revolution’ based on recommendations of the UN Secretary-General’s Independent Expert Advisory Group on a Data Revolution for Sustainable Development.”

Strange, the Australian government avoids any public discussion of global citizenship education, compliance, or the [UNs required ‘data revolution’](#). What are the reasons for, and the implications of, the Australian government’s drive to comply with UN requirements to educate Australian children as ‘global citizens’? Why is the government so resolute in its determination to avoid granting the people a democratic vote on these issues?

So how will the UN check compliance with SDG 4.7 signed by Julie Bishop?

[According to UNESCO, compliance with SDG 4.7 will be assessed by compliance with the requirements of UNESCOs 1974 “Recommendation concerning Education for International Understanding, Co-operation and Peace and Education relating to Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms.”](#)

Some of the requirements of UNESCO’s 1974 recommendation include:

Must obey the UN

3. *“Education should be infused with the aims and purposes set forth in the Charter of the United Nations, the Constitution of UNESCO and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, particularly Article 26, paragraph 2, of the last-named, which states: `Education shall be directed to the full development of the human personality and to the strengthening of respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms. It shall promote understanding, tolerance and friendship among all nations, racial or religious groups, and shall further the activities of the United Nations for the maintenance of peace.”*

Education based upon global perspective & global interdependence - NOT based upon independence & nationalism

4. *“In order to enable every person to contribute actively to the fulfillment-of the aims referred to in paragraph 3, and promote international solidarity and co-operation, which are necessary in solving the world problems affecting the individuals' and communities' life and exercise of fundamental rights and freedoms, the following objectives should be regarded as major guiding principles of educational policy:*

(a) An international dimension and a global perspective in education at all levels and in all its forms;

(b) Understanding and respect for all peoples, their cultures, civilizations, values and ways of life, including domestic ethnic cultures and cultures of other nations;

(c) Awareness of the increasing global interdependence between peoples and nations;”

Each country must follow UN policies.

7. *“Each Member State should formulate and apply national policies aimed at increasing the efficacy of education in all its forms and strengthening its contribution to international understanding and co-operation, to the maintenance and development of a just peace, to the establishment of social justice, to respect for and application of human rights and fundamental freedoms, and to the eradication of the prejudices, misconceptions, inequalities and all forms of injustice which hinder the achievement of these aims.”*

All countries must ensure UN principles are embedded in every child

11. *“Member States should take steps to ensure that the principles of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination become an integral part of the developing personality of each child, adolescent, young person or adult by applying these principles in the daily conduct of education at each level and in all its forms, thus enabling each individual to contribute personally to the regeneration and extension of education in the direction indicated.”*

All countries required to ensure these recommendations are also applied to pre-school children & their parents

24. *“As pre-school education develops, Member States should encourage in it activities which correspond to the purposes of the recommendation because fundamental attitudes, such as, for example, attitudes on race, are often formed in the pre-school years. In this respect, the attitude of parents should be deemed to be an essential factor for the education of children, and the adult education referred to in paragraph 30 should pay special attention to the preparation of parents for their role in pre-school education. The first school should be designed and organized as a social environment having its own character and value, in which various situations, including games, will enable children to become aware of their rights, to assert themselves freely while accepting their responsibilities, and to improve and extend through direct experience their sense of belonging to larger and larger communities-the family, the school, then the local, national and world communities.”*

All countries to ensure educational materials are censored & free of any material which is counter to these recommendations.

39. *“Member States should promote appropriate measures to ensure that educational aids, especially textbooks, are free from elements liable to give rise to misunderstanding, mistrust, racist reactions, contempt or hatred with regard to other groups or peoples. Materials should provide a broad background of knowledge, which will help learners to evaluate information and ideas disseminated through the mass media that seem to run counter to the aims of this recommendation.”*

For the purpose of these recommendations, UNESCO defines the term 'education':

“The word `education' implies the entire process of social life by means of which individuals and social groups learn to develop consciously within, and for the benefit of, the national and international communities, the whole of their personal capacities, attitudes, aptitudes and

knowledge. This process is ~not limited to any specific activities.”

Australia’s need to comply with these requirements may well have been signed by former Foreign Minister Bishop, but deception, surrender to the dictates of the UN, and refusal to grant Australians a democratic vote on foreign interference, are [most definitely counter to Australian interests](#).

Deliberate Globalised Deception, & Avoidance of Democratic Scrutiny of, So Called ‘Non-Binding’ Agreements

It also must be stressed most emphatically, that although the UN and Australian politicians deceptively state that there is no requirement to comply with the provisions of so called ‘non-binding’ international agreements, such as Agenda 21 and the 2030 Agenda, **these claims are made [with the full knowledge and expectation \(as backed by precedents\) that vital provisions of these agreements will indeed become binding eventually](#)**. In fact, such agreements [commonly contain provisions which require them to be enforced by inclusion in domestic legislation](#) around the world so that people can be penalised or gaoled for failing to comply with the dictates of the UN.

But what is global citizenship & who grants it?

The concept of global citizenship is of course opposed to the concept of national citizenship. The global citizen is an undemocratic artificial illegitimate construct of globalisation. The global citizen is NOT one who places his own country, and its democratic structures, ahead of global interests.

Put simply, [as Ban Ki-Moon points out](#), a global citizen sees himself or herself primarily as a member of the ‘human race’, NOT as a citizen of a country.

The global citizen clearly has a global perspective and believes in collectivism, universal values, and sustainable development (constituting a never-ending process, sustainable development has no precise definition). Unlike national citizenship, global citizenship is a flexible rubbery self-applied term with no official responsibilities or entitlement. It is a feel-good term to be utilised when considered desirable.

In the modern era, when global ‘problem solvers’ such as the UN want more power, everyone must be re-educated or indoctrinated with the new global paradigm. Highlighted ‘new’ problems are global we are told, and the only solution is to transfer money, resources, and power, to the UN. This type of indoctrination is commonly referred to as [global citizenship education \(GCE\)](#).

[According to Lagos](#), the title of being a global citizen seems to have “spontaneously erupted” as citizens or “activists” bestow this title upon themselves:

“While various types of global citizens exist, a common thread to their emergence is their base in grassroots activism. We may identify different types of global citizens, yet many of these categories are best summarized by their emergence despite a lack of any global governing body. It is as if they have spontaneously erupted of their own volition..... Any rights and obligations accorded to the global citizen come from the citizens themselves, growing public favor for “universal rights,” the rise of people migrating around the world, and an increasing tendency to standardize citizenship.”

Global citizens, being ‘stateless’ and having abandoned their own country of origin, seem to exist in a vacuum where national democratic values cease to exist. As Jakub Grygiel points out in an article entitled [“There’s no such thing as a global citizen”](#), “a global citizen is like the Himalayan Yeti: a figment of the imaginations of a few, not a living member of the political fauna of the world”:

“The call for global solutions to global problems has become a familiar refrain: If only we could see past our petty national interests, we could come together to solve everything from climate change to poverty to terrorism.....But the global citizen is like the Himalayan Yeti: a figment of the imaginations of a few, not a living member of the political fauna of the world. And it isn’t something we should try to create.....I worry, however, that we are giving up on the goal of

incubating policymakers with a clear sense of national identity and a powerful belief in the necessity and right to protect national interests.....The task of forming reasoning patriots seems to be increasingly ceded to military academies and war colleges, while civilian universities seek to churn out global citizens.....The most immediate risk is that we will face a homogenous and bland educational landscape. Students will have a hard time learning the French or the American perspective on the world, as these will be swapped for whatever the global vision is. So much for intellectual diversity.

More important, if we train elites to be imbued with higher esteem for the abstraction of a global community than for the reality of the particular group in which they live, we deprive our nation of the ability to defend its interests and maintain its well-being. After all, implicit in the argument for global citizenship is the idea that the pursuit of national interests is dangerous because the solitary actions of individual states undermine the possibility of solving global problems.....A global community or citizenry cannot exist, because to love everyone and everything is to love nobody and nothing. Elevating an abstract "global" sweeps away the differences that make, say, the Italian polity and citizenry different from the American ones. When everything is subsumed into a uniform global political mould — a deeply unnatural and ultimately inhuman undertaking — there is nobody in particular to love and for whom to act. The fundamental driver and measure of our actions is destroyed."

Global citizenship is so important to the UN that it "[*must be placed at the centre of education systems*](#)" and central to the UN's [Framework for Action on Education post-2015](#) and the UN Secretary-General's [Global Education First Initiative](#). According to William Jasper, UNESCO's Global Citizenship Education Forum is simply "[*Schooling for World Government*](#)." [UNESCO has long been the driving force behind global citizenship education](#) and now is behind the drive to monitor the implementation of SDG 4.7, signed by former Foreign Minister Bishop, through 2 guiding documents, [Education 2030, Incheon Declaration and Framework for Action](#), and the [2016 Global Education Monitoring Report \(GEM\)](#)..

The Anti-Australian, Anti-Democratic Values Needed to Create Good 'Global Citizens'

The UN's [Global Education First Initiative \(GEFI\)](#) endorsed by [Foreign Minister Bishop](#) and the Australian government, "[*has established education as a means to 'foster global citizenship'*](#)." **In fact, [Australia is one of GEFI's 16 "champion countries"](#). However, In order to achieve acceptance of the concept of global citizenship it is the attitudes and values of our children which must be politically changed. According to [UNESCO's 2016 Global Education Monitoring Report](#):**

"While target 4.7 does not explicitly say as much, the development of the right attitudes is an important dimension of global citizenship education (GCED) and education for sustainable development (ESD)."

It seems the attitudes of our elected representatives have already changed, but now the people, especially our children, need to be re-educated. The [UN has even developed a "Sustainability Literacy Test" \(SULITEST\)](#).

[According to UNESCO the values and attitudes required of global citizens include:](#) "a deep knowledge of global issues and universal values such as justice, equality, dignity and respect" and "behavioural capacities to act collaboratively and responsibly to find global solutions for global challenges, and to strive for the collective good."

Given the fact that [there are no suitable global governance institutions which may grant global citizenship](#), and none are proposed, the discussion about global citizenship represents a destructive global anti-democratic anti-nationalist movement rather than a movement for positive change. [As Michael Muetzelfeldt & Gary Smith point out](#), "to analyse global civil society and global citizenship it is necessary to focus on global governance."

[John Mathiason further explores this matter](#), emphasising the lack of discussion concerning the nature of the relationship between the institutions of global governance and their subjects, the global citizens they seek to create and control:

"Democracy requires two things: a system for providing people with a voice in the making of decisions that affect them and a mechanism for holding representatives accountable to those whom they represent." To this can be added a third, Democracy requires citizens who are able

to exercise their voice and hold their representatives accountable. This implies world citizenship. But what does this mean?..... Perhaps the greatest defect is that the discourse on global governance does not focus on the relationship between the individual and the new suprastate machinery in the terms that define citizenship....If one considers oneself a citizen of something, one has to believe that one can influence decisions and one has to accept to abide by them. The Nation-state has provided that locus of citizenship, successfully when individuals believe that through their vote or their voice they help make political decisions and reciprocate by their behavior in paying taxes, doing public service and obeying the law..... While schools in a number of countries, under the rubric of sustainability education, are beginning to introduce concepts like global climate and environment in the curriculum, nowhere is there a curriculum to discuss the new roles of the international public sector in this. The concepts behind world civic competence are not explicit and, as such, are not taught.”

[Robert Kuttner](#) also draws attention to the unsurmountable obstacles preventing a true global democracy:

“In general, global institutions of governance tend to be less penetrable by citizens than domestic democratic institutions, for several interlocking reasons. There is no global state, hence no global democracy. As a general rule, in the absence of true global government or global democratic citizenship, the shift to global governance tends to advantage elites at the expense of democratic accountability to citizens.Converting even public institutions of global governance into bodies of democratic accountability comparable to the democratic institutions of nation states is immensely difficult and may be structurally impossible absent a drastically different set of policy goals on the part of the national governments that are the architects and prime constituents of global governing bodies.”

Dumbing Down the Children & Reorienting Education in Support of the UNs Global Agenda

The [Education for Sustainable Development Toolkit](#) emphasises 5 telling points:

1. **“Unlike most education movements, ESD was *initiated by people outside of the education community*. In fact, one major push for ESD came from international political and economic forums (e.g., United Nations, Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development, Organization of American States)”**
2. **“Generally, *more highly educated people, who have higher incomes, consume more resources than poorly educated people, who tend to have lower incomes. In this case, more education increases the threat to sustainability”***
3. **“*Simply adding more to the curriculum will not be feasible in most schools; they already have a full curriculum. Deciding what to leave out - what does not contribute to sustainability or is obsolete - is an integral part of the reorienting process..... The challenge for communities in the process of creating ESD curriculums will be to select knowledge that will support their sustainability goals. An accompanying challenge will be to let go of those topics that have been successfully taught for years but are no longer relevant.*”**
4. **“*it is also evident that simply increasing basic literacy, as it is currently taught in most countries, will not support a sustainable society..... if communities and nations hope to identify sustainability goals and work toward them, they must focus on skills, values, and perspectives that encourage and support public participation and community decision making.*”**
5. **“*Reorienting education to address sustainability is a huge project. It will require activity on the national, regional, state/provincial, and local levels. It will probably involve a long list of government officials, legislators, administrators, teachers, unions, and non-profit organizations.*”**

[As the Toolkit notes](#), the curriculum needed “weeding” to remove ‘unnecessary’ educational content and replace it with the dictates of the UN. To cite the Toolkit directly:

“Reduce the number of units in the current curriculum to make room for education for sustainability.

Weeding the Curriculum

Purpose:

To evaluate each unit in the current curriculum for relevance to daily life and community sustainability goals.

Comments:

This exercise is most effective if community sustainability goals have been defined. If your community does not have sustainability goals, omit the shaded portions of the worksheet. Exercises facilitating the development of community sustainability goals include *Envisioning a Sustainable Future* and *Creating Community Sustainability Goals: Deciding What is Important*, found elsewhere in this Toolkit

Group size: 3 or more participants.

Time Needed: 2 to 3 hours, depending on the number of units to be reviewed.

Materials:

- Copies of unit descriptions, including a list of concepts found in the curriculum, one per participant
- Copies of your community's list of sustainability goals, one per participant.
- Copies of the Curriculum Evaluation worksheet.

Preparation:

In the spaces provided on the Curriculum Evaluation worksheet, write the unit titles. Use as many sheets as necessary. Make photocopies to distribute to participants.

Directions:

1. Distribute worksheets, unit descriptions, and community sustainability goal lists to your participants.
2. Ask your participants to read the first unit description and determine how often they use such concepts in daily life. Ask participants to assign a value to the unit, following the directions given on the worksheet. Explain that if a participant uses x , he/she must explain this choice in the area provided.
3. Ask participants to evaluate whether or not the unit reinforces one or more community sustainability goals.
4. Repeat Steps 2 and 3 for each unit under consideration.
5. Collect the worksheets and give your participants a 30-minute break while you tabulate the data.
6. Calculate the average score for each unit. If a unit received any x s, tally the number of x s and subtract this number from your total number of participants. Use this new number to calculate the average. Be sure to note the number of x s next to the score. (Examples of average scores include $1.75xxxx$ and $3x$.)
7. While your participants are on break, list the units on the chalkboard in descending order by average score received, ranking scores with x higher than scores without (e.g., $3x$ is ranked higher than 3, which is ranked higher than $2x$.)
8. Invite your participants to return; redistribute the worksheets.
9. Examine the rankings list on the chalkboard. As a group, determine the threshold above which units will be kept and below which units will no longer be taught.
10. Discuss each unit falling below the threshold as it pertains to your community's sustainability goals. If the group determines that a unit reinforces these goals, we recommend it be kept. If the group determines that a unit does not reinforce these goals, we recommend it be reserved for later discussion of ways it might be enhanced to reinforce the goals of your community. If a unit is determined to run counter to your community's sustainability goals, we recommend it be dropped from the curriculum."

And the students needed to be introduced to the UN's concept of sustainability with a lesson entitled, ["Drain or Sustain?"](#)

This hands-on exercise puts participants in the middle of an easy-to-understand sustainability dilemma.

Drain or Sustain?

Purpose: To introduce participants to the concept of sustainable development.

Comments: For a closer examination of the concept of sustainable development, see also the exercises *Seeing Your Community Through a Sustainability Lens* and *S.E.E. the Links*, found elsewhere in this Toolkit.

Group size: 4 to 36 participants.

Time Needed: 30 minutes.

Materials:

- A large number of small pebbles.
- Paper and pencils for keeping score.
- Extension: A chalkboard and chalk.

Directions:

1. Divide the group into communities of four.
2. Place 16 pebbles in a communal pile for each community.
3. Explain the rules of the game:
 - The pebble pile represents a valuable renewable resource. The resource is replenished after each round of play.
 - Each community member may take freely from the resource pile each round.
 - Each community member must take at least one pebble in each round to survive.
4. One person in each community must record the number of pieces taken by each community member in each round.
5. After each round, count how many pebbles each community has remaining in the pile, and add an equivalent number of pebbles to the pile.
6. Play three or four rounds, pausing after each round to find out if any community members did not survive.
7. Play one final round, then have community members share what happened in their communities:
 - In which communities did everyone survive?
 - Which community had the most pebbles in the resource pile at the end of the game?
 - Which communities are confident they will always have enough pebbles for everyone as long as the pile is renewed? How did these communities arrive at that point? What strategies were used
 - Was there a leader in these communities? If so, why did the community listen to that person?
 - Could these communities have reached “pebble sustainability” without communication?
8. Compare per capita pebble ownership around the room.
 - Out of the whole room, who had amassed the most pebbles? How did he or she accomplish this?
 - Did this keep others from surviving?
 - Where do we see this type of greed in the real world?
9. Start a discussion of the following:
 - What information is necessary to know how to manage a resource sustainably (e.g., community size, resource renewal rate, environmental carrying capacity, etc.)?
 - What is needed to actually put information into practice (e.g., leadership, communication, trust, legislation, understanding of consequences, examples of failure, etc.)?

Extension:

10. Propose that all communities are taking pebbles from one communal pile. Some communities are at war with one another, and some are unaware of the others.
 - Would the pebbles still need management? How would these factors affect the management of the pebbles?
 - Would these situations change how community members felt about adhering to their sustainable usage?
 - How might global pebble usage be managed? Write suggestions on the chalkboard.
11. Now explain that this scenario represents the current state of our common resource, the atmosphere. Automobile and factory carbon dioxide emissions are heating up the atmosphere, causing the “greenhouse effect” and changing the ecology of the planet. Each pebble taken represents one “share” of carbon dioxide emissions generated by that person.

- How do the communities that reached sustained usage feel about the “greedy” communities’ usage?
- How can the atmosphere be managed? Would the suggestions listed on the chalkboard be useful in this situation?
- What are other “real life” examples of shared resource issues?

Note:

The pebbles represent a valuable renewable resource. In the United States, this game is often played with individually wrapped candies. The participants are told they can keep and eat the candies they have at the end of the game. Using candies or coins rather than pebbles helps participants understand the temptation and greed associated with this game and how it applies to the real world. The authors realize that playing with food is not culturally acceptable in many societies.

United We Stand, Divided We Fall

Although the ESD Toolkit teaches children “Unity is Strength”, the entire philosophy of the United Nations is to divide, and celebrate ‘diversity’ (22, 23, 24, 25, 26). Diversity, separatism, and fragmentation are of course the pathway to chaos. The entire UN philosophy though, is based upon discrimination, segregation, and dividing society into stereotyped groups, or minority groups, on the basis of ethnicity, culture, sexuality, religion etc (27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32). The UN poses as a collectivist global institution but their philosophy constantly divides people into various minority groups, pitting one group against another and discriminating against those outside these groups.

According to the UN a minority group is defined thus:

- *“The term minority as used in the United Nations human rights system usually refers to national or ethnic, religious and linguistic minorities, pursuant to the United Nations Minorities Declaration”*
- *“All States have one or more minority groups within their national territories, characterized by their own national, ethnic, linguistic or religious identity, which differs from that of the majority population.”*
- *“According to a definition offered in 1977 by Francesco Capotorti, Special Rapporteur of the United Nations Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities, a minority is: A group numerically inferior to the rest of the population of a State, in a non-dominant position, whose members - being nationals of the State - possess ethnic, religious or linguistic characteristics differing from those of the rest of the population and show, if only implicitly, a sense of solidarity, directed towards preserving their culture, traditions, religion or language.”*

Members of these groups are singled out for special support by the UN and by definition, if the group eventually becomes a majority group, then the members of that group no longer qualify for special support. **In other words, those in need are NOT entitled to special support unless they belong to a minority group as defined by the UN.** This type of belief system is being used to destroy unity in society, in education and amongst our children, and even in the armed forces.

The ESD Toolkit may well teach that “Unity is Strength”, but our politicians are doing their best to help the UN destroy that strength and cohesion, destroy the team and destroy the team spirit. They are seeking to destroy the values that bind people together.

According to the UN it is no longer the needy that deserve support, rather, it is those whom the UN designates as belonging to a select ‘minority group’. But ‘conservatives’ are rapidly becoming a minority group!