

# ***Domestic Policy & the United Nations***

## ***Charter Authorizes Promotion of Human Rights & Social Good, But Prohibits UN From Making Domestic Policy for Nations***

*by Thomas W. Jacobson (2003)*

The United Nations was formed in 1945 in the closing moments of World War II primarily to avoid World War III: “to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war”<sup>1</sup>; to “maintain international peace and security”<sup>2</sup>; to “develop friendly relations among nations”<sup>3</sup>; and to “achieve international co-operation in solving international problems.”<sup>4</sup> In its Charter, the UN was granted power by its founding governments to *promote* “respect for human rights and for fundamental freedoms,”<sup>5</sup> and to *make recommendations* to Member Nations and the UN General Assembly on “international economic, social, cultural, educational, health, and related matters.”<sup>6</sup> But the Charter prohibits the UN from making domestic policies for nations, and enforcing those policies upon them. Indeed, in Article II, under “Purposes and Principles,” the Charter states:

Nothing contained in the present Charter shall authorize the United Nations to intervene in matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any (nation) or shall require the Members to submit such matters to settlement under the present Charter.<sup>7</sup>

In its early years, the UN and its Member Nations adhered to the Charter and did not intervene in the domestic affairs of nations. Gradually, however, the UN and delegations from Member Nations drifted beyond the legal parameters of the Charter, and increasingly made and imposed domestic policies upon nations. To the extent they did, they subverted the rule of law because Member Nations did not follow the Charter’s amendment process to obtain permission to increase the UN’s powers and functions. Since 1994, domestic policy has dominated UN international conferences.

The great danger is when government officials and judges view these international domestic policies as *customary international law*, and use them to trump national and local laws. Doing so violates the sovereignty of nations and the principle that no civil authority can be legitimately exercised without the consent of the governed, thus stripping entire peoples and their rulers of their God-given right to govern their own affairs.

### ***The Primary Purpose of the United Nations***

The primary purpose for which the 52 founding national governments formed the United Nations was given in the opening statements of the Charter: to prevent future world wars and “unite our strength to maintain international peace and security.” Also, Article 1 states that the “Purposes of the United Nations are ... To maintain international peace and security.”<sup>8</sup>

---

Mr. Jacobson originally wrote this paper in 2002, and revised it in 2003, when he was serving as Representative to the United Nations for Focus on the Family (U.S.A.), from 2001 to 2010.

The Security Council was entrusted with “primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security.”<sup>9</sup> The General Assembly was granted power to consider and recommend “general principles of co-operation in the maintenance of international peace and security.”<sup>10</sup> The provisions for International Economic and Social Co-operation were permitted within the context of facilitating conditions “for peaceful and friendly relations among nations.”<sup>11</sup> The first basic objective of the trusteeship system—designed to help nations who were not able to govern themselves to become self-governing, especially those devastated during WWII—was “to further international peace and security.”<sup>12</sup>

### ***UN May Promote But Not Mandate Domestic Policies for Member Nations***

The UN Charter authorizes the United Nations, its General Assembly and agencies, to study, reaffirm, promote, and make recommendations concerning human rights and domestic matters; and even to work with nations on a voluntary basis to “achieve international co-operation in solving international problems of an economic, social, cultural or humanitarian character.”<sup>13</sup> But nothing in the UN Charter authorizes the UN to make international domestic laws and then impose those laws upon nations, even with the apparent consent of delegations representing those nations. Doing so goes beyond the authority granted in the Charter, and violates the provision prohibiting intervention in domestic affairs.

Here is what the Charter says the UN can do in relation to domestic affairs:

- The General Assembly can *study* and “*make recommendations* for the purpose of ... promoting international co-operation in the economic, social, cultural, educational, and health fields, and assistance in the realization of human rights and fundamental freedoms for all.”<sup>14</sup>
- The UN in general and its specialized agencies are charged to “*promote*” [not mandate]:
  - “solutions of international economic, social, health and related problems” ... and
  - “universal respect for, and observance of, human rights and fundamental freedoms.”<sup>15</sup>
- The UN’s Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC) was given the function of making “*studies and reports*” and “*recommendations*” on these matters. It may also “prepare draft conventions” and call “international conferences on matters falling within its competence.” Further, it may “co-ordinate the activities of the specialized agencies [e.g., UNICEF, UN Population Fund] through *consultation* ... and *recommendations*.” Finally, it may even “make arrangements with” Member Nations “to obtain reports on the steps taken to give effect to its own recommendations.”<sup>16</sup> (emphasis added)

The powers given to the UN and its General Assembly, Economic and Social Council and specialized agencies were to *study*, *make recommendations* and *promote* human rights and social policies on the basis of the consensus of the Member Nations. Even the reports that ECOSOC seeks from nations cannot be compelled; nations are free to give or withhold reports.

## ***Domestic Policies: Adherence to Charter in Early Years***

When the UN began to address domestic matters, it proclaimed the 1948 *Universal Declaration of Human Rights* as “a common standard of achievement for all peoples and all nations.”<sup>17</sup> It promoted human rights, freedom, many good domestic policies and the rule of law. While recommending a standard, in keeping with its Charter it did not mandate that standard upon nations, nor require nations to submit periodic reports documenting their compliance.

In 1956, when ECOSOC wanted human rights reports from Member Nations, the Council did not demand the reports, but passed a resolution formerly requesting the reports.

The Economic and Social Council ... *Requests* States members ... to transmit ... every three years, a report describing developments ... in the field of human rights, and measures taken to safeguard human liberty.<sup>18</sup> (emphasis *not* added)

When ECOSOC wanted more information in 1965, they passed another resolution:

The Economic and Social Council ... *Invites* States Members ... to supply information regularly on human rights and fundamental freedoms.<sup>19</sup> (emphasis *not* added)

## ***Gradual Departure from Charter, But Little Enforcement***

The first notable departure from the Charter on domestic policy issues came in 1952, in the *Convention on the Political Rights of Women*. The opening sentence states:

Desiring to *implement* the principle of equality of rights for men and women contained in the Charter of the United Nations”<sup>20</sup> (emphasis added).

The shift began from “promote” to pressuring nations to “implement.” For the contracting nations, this Convention mandates that they give women the right to vote, to be eligible for election to any public office, and to exercise any public functions, “on equal terms with men, without any distinction.”<sup>21</sup> Yet these are domestic matters for individual nations to determine.

The next significant departure came in 1965 when the UN decided it would “*develop and guarantee* political, civil, economic, social and cultural rights,”<sup>22</sup> going far beyond “promoting” (emphasis added).

In 1966, delegates from UN Member Nations created two major international covenants: the *International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights* and the *International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights*.<sup>23</sup> By calling these documents “covenants” instead of “conventions,” the participating nations made a solemn covenant between themselves to uphold the provisions. The Covenants read like a Bill of Rights, requiring party nations to respect:

- Inalienable rights, such as life, liberty and equal justice<sup>24</sup>; as well as
- UN/State so-called “rights,” including:
  - “adequate food, clothing and housing,”
  - “fundamental right of everyone to be free from hunger,”

- “enjoyment of the highest attainable standard of physical and mental health,”
- “right of everyone to education.”<sup>25</sup>

Protecting the lives and liberties, and preserving other inalienable rights of their own people, is the first duty of any civil government, with or without any encouragement from the UN. Yet while the social factors mentioned above are laudable goals, for the UN and nations to give government guarantees to such social rights—“rights provided by the State”<sup>26</sup>—is *national and global socialism*.

Even so, the UN exercised little enforcement power over domestic and human rights matters. Reports from participating nations, however, were no longer voluntary, but mandatory.

### ***Dramatic & Extensive Departure from Charter, with Increased Enforcement***

By its title, the 1979 *Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW)* would appear to be of noble purposes; but, going beyond socialism, it was the most radical departure from the purposes and principles of the UN. CEDAW, instead of encouraging men to love their wives and children, and faithfully provide for them, thus strengthening marriages and families:

- Rejected the family as designed by the Creator by attempting to alter the structures of family and society, and “change ... the traditional role of men ... (and) women”;
- Called for the elimination of “any distinction” between men and women;
- Guaranteed that a woman can choose “a family name,” where to live, and whether to use family planning services (in today’s terms, including abortion), totally apart from the desires or will of her husband and children;
- Envisioned a “new international economic order” wherein all women are working outside their homes and have equal rights, pay and positions with men;
- Sought to redefine the value of a woman based on her having equal decision-making power and leadership with her husband in the home, and with other men in all areas of society and government.<sup>27</sup>

Full implementation of such misguided policies would set wives against husbands, alienate children from their mothers and deprive them of irreplaceable nurturing care, tear apart marriages and families, destroy respect for authority at home and in society, and deny the God-made differences between men and women, thus negating the unique contributions each may make to stable families and nations.

The Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women was established by CEDAW,<sup>28</sup> and takes its enforcement duties very seriously. After nations file their periodic reports, the Committee chastises them if they have not complied with provisions of CEDAW; and is now going beyond CEDAW, ridiculing domestic policies with which it does not agree. In July 2001, when the tiny Catholic nation of Andorra defended its report, the Andorra representative told the Committee that unborn children have the right to life and abortion is a crime in his nation. The Committee responded by interrogating the official to find out how women who wanted abortions could get them, and how Andorra’s Education Office could

mandate a government-approved sex education class in the Catholic schools.<sup>29</sup> (For a compilation of selected statements made by the CEDAW Committee criticizing nations and pressuring them to change their laws, see Focus on the Family USA's United Nations Brief 2002-05, titled, "CEDAW Committee Rulings Against U.N. Member Nations.")

### ***Nations Pressured to Comply with UN Policies & UN Committee Member Views***

Directly and indirectly, nations are being pressured to conform their laws to domestic policies created by the UN or at UN conferences. The UN Population Fund and several European nations (who provided donor funding) pressured Max Padilla, the Nicaraguan Secretary of Family, to change a domestic policy on gender or risk losing millions of dollars in aid. He refused. They went to the president of Nicaragua and demanded that Padilla be fired and the policy changed. Padilla was fired and the policy was changed.<sup>30</sup>

As already indicated, some of the committees that oversee implementation of UN treaties are going beyond the provisions of the respective treaties, attempting to exercise arbitrary power over nations. The UN Committee on the Rights of the Child, which oversees implementation of the 1989 Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC), claims that all children should be given access to reproductive health information and services (which may include abortion), without parental consent.<sup>31</sup> This goes beyond the provisions of the CRC, violates the laws of many nations, and ignores the responsibilities of parents for their children. In October 2001, this same Committee pressured the small nation of Qatar to withdraw their reservations to the CRC<sup>32</sup>—which means the Committee wanted Qatar to enforce the CRC provisions they officially rejected.

### ***Domestic Policy Dominates UN Conferences and Agenda***

International conferences organized to make global domestic policies have dominated the UN agenda since 1992.

- 1992: *Rio Declaration on Environment and Development*—Rio de Janeiro, Brazil
- 1993: *World Conference on Human Rights*—Vienna, Austria
- 1994: *International Conference on Population and Development*—Cairo, Egypt
- 1995: *World Summit for Social Development*—Copenhagen, Denmark
- 1995: *4<sup>th</sup> World Conference on Women*—Beijing, China
- 1996: *The Habitat Agenda*—Istanbul, Turkey
- 1997: Rio+5—New York, U.S.A.
- 1999: Cairo+5—New York, U.S.A.
- 2000: Beijing+5—New York, U.S.A.
- 2000: Copenhagen+5—Geneva, Switzerland
- 2001: *Habitat II / Istanbul+5*—New York, U.S.A.
- 2002: *World Summit on Children (Child Summit)*—New York, U.S.A.
- 2002: Rio+10—Johannesburg, South Africa

More than any other conferences in the UN's history, *Cairo*, *Beijing* and *Copenhagen*, and their 5-year follow-up conferences, as well as the *Child Summit*, focused extensively and almost exclusively on formulating domestic policy in areas such as:

Family  
Women  
Children  
Girls  
Gender  
Health Care

Sexuality  
Reproductive Health  
Contraception  
Family Planning  
Abortion  
STDs & AIDS

Food  
Housing  
Education  
Employment  
Voting

These are all domestic matters within the jurisdiction of nations. Also, apart from wars, the vast majority of human rights violations are domestic, not international, matters.

### ***Change in Language Reflects Movement Toward Global Enforcement***

The tone and force of the language in the international documents has changed:

- from broad general statements promoting human rights and certain domestic policies;
- to declaring that participating nations agree to adopt specific policies in their laws;
- to demanding that nations conform their domestic laws to UN conventions.

Here is a sampling:

*Universal Declaration of  
Human Rights, 1948*

“All are equal before the law”  
“Everyone has the right to own property”<sup>»xxxiii</sup>

*Convention on Political  
Rights of Women, 1952*

“Women shall be entitled to vote”  
“Women shall be entitled to hold public office”<sup>»xxxiv</sup>

*Int’l Covenant on Civil &  
Political Rights, 1966*

“All persons shall be equal before the courts”  
“State Parties to the present Covenant  
undertake to ensure ...”<sup>»xxxv</sup>

*Convention on Elimination of  
All Forms of Discrimination  
Against Women (CEDAW), 1979*

“State Parties shall take all appropriate measures  
... To modify the social and cultural  
patterns of conduct of men and women”<sup>»xxxvi</sup>

*International Conference on  
Population & Development, 1994*

“Basic reproductive health, including family-  
planning services...(includes)...abortion”<sup>»xxxvii</sup>

Phrases like “States shall” (the UN rarely refers to nations as “nations”), “participating States shall,” or “Actions to be taken at the national level by Governments” have become commonplace in UN declarations, covenants and world conference documents addressing domestic policies.

### ***Delegates Use Semantics To Hide Bad Plans***

The UN and influential national delegates have developed a new language art form to hide their unbending advocacy for abortion, immorality and homosexuality. To promote such policies, these delegates, often with the support of thousands of supporting liberal NGO’s (Non-governmental organizations granted permission to attend UN meetings) disguise their true intentions through semantics. They use words that appear to mean something good, while carefully avoiding any acknowledgment of their true intentions. Here are some examples:

### Phrases in UN Documents

“reproductive health services”  
“reproductive health care”  
“fertility regulation”  
“reproductive rights”  
“responsible sexual behavior”  
  
“various forms of the family”

### True Meaning & Agenda

includes abortion & abortifacients  
may include abortion & abortifacients  
includes “interrupting unwanted pregnancies”  
includes “right” to immorality & adultery  
attempting to protect oneself from STDs and  
AIDS when engaging in sex outside marriage  
intended to include same-sex partners

One delegate let the cat out of the bag during the *Child Summit* negotiations in June, 2001. When Terry Miller, head of the U.S. delegation, asked for clarification of the word “services” in a sentence about “reproductive health,” there was dead silence. Then the Canadian delegate said:

“Of course it includes, and I hate to say the word, but it includes abortion.”

The type and frequency of language in the *Child Summit* draft document revealed the true intent of many influential delegates, or groups of delegations, at the UN [i.e., European Union, Canada and some Latin American (Rio Group) delegations]. For example, “clean drinking water,” which should be a first priority for many developing nations, was mentioned 5 times. Standard “health care,” another great need for the same nations, was mentioned 2 times. But “reproductive health care,” “education,” “information,” “services” and “programs” were mentioned 8 times.<sup>xxxviii</sup> In practice, most notably in Africa, Latin America and China, the UN and UNFPA are gaining a reputation for quickly providing reproductive health care education and services while ignoring other glaring human needs, even after natural disasters.

### ***Customary International Law: Grave Danger to Liberty & National Sovereignty***

Why such a push to create all this domestic policy? The United Nations has a new vision for the 21<sup>st</sup> century. It is a global vision with the UN at the center, making international and domestic policies for nations, some of which may be enforced against any person in the world through the International Criminal Court (ICC). The UN is developing a comprehensive web of new international law with over 500 international conventions and treaties—called the “Multi-Lateral Treaty Framework.” By repeating specific policies in multiple international documents, the UN is developing “customary international law.” International judges and most national governments view customary international law as superceding national, state and local government laws.

The United Nations itself acknowledged this transition—from making policy recommendations to forming international customary law—in their book covering 50 years of involvement in human rights (1945-1995). The UN admitted that the “recommendation” was “the main weapon” it had to influence public policy; but said, “Unlike treaties, recommendations do no create a legal obligation for States” (Nations).<sup>xxxix</sup> Then it went on to say:

(C)ertain United Nations human rights standards, presented in the form of recommendations, have taken on such authority that they are widely considered to constitute or to strengthen a rule of customary international law.<sup>xl</sup>

In other words, the UN and its Member Nations have arbitrarily come to view the policies they make as customary international law.

The first customary international law case was filed in Federal District Court during the spring of 2001. The Center for Reproductive Law and Policy (CRLP) filed the lawsuit against President George W. Bush for reinstating former President Reagan's "Mexico City Policy," which prohibits any U.S. tax dollar support of international organizations that promote or perform abortions.<sup>xli</sup> The CRLP claims that the right to abortion, supported in "reproductive health" and "reproductive rights" language repeated in international documents, is now a human right—a right they claim has become part of customary international law.

Thus far, the UN—apart from the temporary international tribunals for specific nations or conflicts, such as Rwanda and the former Yugoslavia—has had little ability to enforce its policies upon individuals. That is changing. The Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court was signed by 139 nations and, as of January 2003, has been ratified by 87 nations. On July 1, 2002, after 60 nations ratified the Statute, the ICC was authorized to come into existence, and will try its first cases in 2003. It will be the first court in history to claim jurisdiction over every person in the world, whether or not his or her nation has ratified the Statute. (See Focus on the Family USA' United Nations Brief 2003-01, "8 Reasons the U.S.A. Should Not Participate in the International Criminal Court," and Brief 2003-02, "First International Criminal Court Created with Global Jurisdiction: A Regional Analysis of the Nations which have Ratified the ICC Statute.")

### ***Concluding Remarks***

The United Nations was not formed to create and enforce domestic policies for nations. If Member Nations wanted to use the UN to do so, they should have exercised the provisions in Article XVIII, which give the procedure for amending the UN Charter. To amend the Charter requires approval of at least two-thirds of the members of the General Assembly, and constitutional ratification by at least two-thirds of the Member Nations.

Unless the Charter is amended, the United States and the other Member Nations should restore the UN to its original Charter, purposes and principles; and require it to cease making domestic policy as well as void every domestic policy mandate in any of its documents.

We are on a course toward global tyranny as the UN seeks to enforce domestic policies, to implement its vision for a "Global New Deal" and to develop "customary international law."

We are approaching an unprecedented moment in history when the liberties of every person, and the national sovereignty of every nation, will stand at risk because the leaders of most nations have given over so much of the civil authority entrusted to them to the United Nations. When they do so, they cede to the UN their solemn duty to protect the lives, liberties and inalienable rights of their citizens, and to preserve the sovereignty of their nations.

Our forefathers formed the United States and it became a beacon of liberty for the world because they: valued religious and civil liberty above security and comfort; prized God-given inalienable rights (not government-granted rights) above their own lives; did not expect or want

the government to be their provider; demanded that the people had a right to choose their own rulers; and firmly insisted that there should be no taxation without representation. Global socialism could destroy everything they gained for us, including the liberty and prosperity we enjoy today.

---

<sup>1</sup> Charter of the United Nations, opening sentence.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, Chapter I, Article 1, par. 1; see also, Chap. 5, Art. 24, par. 1.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, Chapter I, Article 1, par. 2.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, Chapter I, Article 1, par. 3.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, Chap. I, Art. 1, par. 3; see also, Chap. IV, Art. 13, par. 1(b); Chap. X, Art. 62, par. 2.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, Chap. X, Art. 62, par. 1.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, Chap. I, Article 2, par. 7.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, preamble/opening statements; Chap. I, Art. 1.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*, Chap. V, Art. 24, par. 1.

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*, Chap. IV, Art. 11, par. 1.

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*, Chap. IX, Art. 55, opening paragraph.

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.*, Chap. XII, Art. 76, par. (a).

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.*, Chap. I, Art. 1, par. 3.

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.*, Chap. IV, Art. 13, par. 1(b).

<sup>15</sup> *Ibid.*, Chap. IX, Arts. 55, pars. (b) & (c).

<sup>16</sup> *Ibid.*, Chap. X, Arts. 62-64.

<sup>17</sup> *Universal Declaration of Human Rights, The United Nations and Human Rights: 1945-1995* (New York: Department of Public Information, United Nations), 1995, p. 153.

<sup>18</sup> *Ibid.*, Human Rights, *Economic and Social Council Resolution on Periodic Reports on Human Rights and Studies of Specific Rights or Groups of Rights*, par. 1, p. 198 [Document E/RES/624 B (XXII), 1 August 1956].

<sup>19</sup> *Ibid.*, Human Rights, *Economic and Social Council Resolution on Periodic Reports on Human Rights and Reports on Freedom of Information*, par. 6, p. 213 [Document E/RES/1074 C (XXXIX), 28 July 1965].

<sup>20</sup> *Ibid.*, Human Rights, *Convention on the Political Rights of Women*, Preamble, p. 180.

<sup>21</sup> *Ibid.*, Articles I-III.

<sup>22</sup> *Ibid.*, Human Rights, *General Assembly Resolution on the International Year for Human Rights*, par. 13, p. 216 [Document A/RES/2081 (XX), 20 December 1965].

<sup>23</sup> *Ibid.*, Human Rights, see International Covenants on pp. 229-244 [Docs. A/RES/2200 A (XXI), 16 Dec. 1966].

<sup>24</sup> *Ibid.*, Human Rights, *International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights*, Arts. 6 & 9, p. 236.

<sup>25</sup> *Ibid.*, Human Rights, *International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights*, Arts. 11-13, pp. 231-232.

<sup>26</sup> *Ibid.*, Art. 4, p. 230.

<sup>27</sup> *Ibid.*, Human Rights, *Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women*, Preamble; Arts. 1; 16(g); 15(4); 12(1); 14(2.b), pp. 277-281 [Document A/RES/34/180, 18 December 1979].

<sup>28</sup> *Ibid.*, Human Rights, *Convention on Women*, Part V, Arts. 17-22, pp. 281-282.

<sup>29</sup> "UN Pushes For Abortion In Small European Catholic Country," *EWTN News Brief*, July 13, 2001.

<sup>30</sup> "Nicaraguan Delegate Fired For Pro-Family View," *Friday Fax*, Catholic Family & Human Rights Institute, Volume 4, No. 11, March 2, 2001. Available on web at: [www.c-fam.org](http://www.c-fam.org).

<sup>31</sup> *Ibid.*, *Friday Fax*, "Diplomat Charges UN Committee With Misuse of UN Documents," Volume 4, No. 33, July 27, 2001.

- 
- <sup>32</sup> “Withdraw Reservations To Convention, Committee Tells Qatar,” *UN Wire*, United Nations Foundation, October 4, 2001; [www.unfoundation.org/unwire/2001/10/04/current.asp](http://www.unfoundation.org/unwire/2001/10/04/current.asp).
- <sup>xxxiii</sup> *Ibid.*, Human Rights, *Universal Declaration of Human Rights*, Arts. 7 & 17, p. 154.
- <sup>xxxiv</sup> *Ibid.*, Human Rights, *Convention on Political Rights of Women*, Arts. I & III, p. 180.
- <sup>xxxv</sup> *Ibid.*, Human Rights, *Int’l Cov. Civil & Political Rights*, Arts. 14; 3; see also, Arts. 2, par. 1; 18, par. 4; 40; pp. 235-241.
- <sup>xxxvi</sup> *Ibid.*, Human Rights, *Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women*, Art. 5, p. 278.
- <sup>xxxvii</sup> *International Conference on Population and Development*, Cairo 1994, par. 13.14, opening paragraph & (b).
- <sup>xxxviii</sup> “Third Revised Draft Outcome Document,” *A World Fit for Children*. This was the version of a document debated at the Preparatory Committee for the Special Session of the General Assembly on Children Third Substantive Session, held in New York City, June 11-15, 2001. Document A/AC.256/CRP.6/Rev.3.
- <sup>xxxix</sup> *Op. cit.*, Human Rights, Part II, “Establishing the System: From the Charter to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1945-1948),” par. 23, p. 6.
- <sup>xl</sup> *Ibid.*, par. 24, p. 7.
- <sup>xli</sup> *Op. cit.*, *Friday Fax*, “Federal Lawsuit Reveals Long-Time UN Strategy of Pro-Abortionists,” Volume 4, No. 27, June 22, 2001.