



Media Spotlight

A BIBLICAL ANALYSIS OF RELIGIOUS AND SECULAR MEDIA

SPECIAL REPORT

THE UNITED NATIONS CONVENTION ON THE RIGHTS OF THE CHILD

THE NEW WORLD ORDER VS. PARENTAL RIGHTS

by Albert James Dager

In 1979, the United Nations Organization celebrated the "International Year of the Child" (IYC). The United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund (UNICEF) was the agency chosen through which the U.N. would implement their programs for IYC. The platform upon which the IYC program was based was the "Declaration of the Rights of the Child," unanimously passed by the U.N. General Assembly on November 20, 1959.

Since the adoption of the Declaration, member states of the U.N. have worked through their respective government agencies to implement the principles and programs formulated through the Declaration. Until now, implementation has been on a voluntary basis; there has been no formal U.N. mandate to require accountability to an international governing body. This could change within a very short time should the present Convention on the Rights of the Child be ratified by a sufficient number of member states (at least 42).

The Convention on the Rights of the Child is a formal attempt by the U.N. to enact into law international sanctions that would enforce the goals of the original Declaration as well as several other United Nations documents.

As important and far-reaching as this pending international legislation may be, it is curious that the general news media have had little to say about it. It's as if there were a cloud of secrecy over the fact that, even today, every US senator and congressman has the Convention before him or her; all

that is necessary for it to go into effect in the United States is for one person to sponsor it in either house of Congress, and have it pass by the required majorities of each house.

Should the Convention on the Rights of the Child be ratified by the US Congress it will become the law of the land; every provision of the Convention must then be complied with under penalty of international law. What this may mean in terms of individual freedom and the sanctity of family relationships is something all true believers in the Lord Jesus Christ must ponder.

To help our readers understand the full implications of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, we will examine the text of the Convention resolution as it currently stands, considering how passage of the Convention will affect those whose faith is in the Lord Jesus Christ.

At the very root of the Convention lies a moral and philosophical world view that runs counter to that of God's Word. That world view is humanistic which, in itself is religious in principle and practice. This will be amply demonstrated as we consider the text of the Convention.

For purposes of brevity we will be looking at those portions of the Convention which we believe will affect the practice of biblical Christianity.

While the Convention will be the legal means by which the U.N. will enforce its goals on human rights for children, it is by no means the only instrument that will affect the implementation of those goals. The Preamble to the Convention names

several other international covenants and declarations which the Convention will enforce. For clarity those covenants and declarations are highlighted in bold type.

PREAMBLE

The States Parties to the present Convention,

Considering that, in accordance with the principles proclaimed in the **Charter of the United Nations**, recognition of the inherent dignity and of the equal and inalienable rights of all members of the human family is the foundation of freedom, justice and peace in the world,

Recognizing that the United Nations has, in the **Universal Declaration of Human Rights and in the International Covenants on Human Rights**, proclaimed and agreed that everyone is entitled to all the rights and freedoms set forth therein, without distinction of any kind, such as race, colour, sex, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, property, birth or other status,

Recalling that, in the **Universal Declaration of Human Rights**, the United Nations has proclaimed that childhood is entitled to special care and assistance,

Convinced that the family, as the fundamental group of society and the natural environment for the growth and well-being of all its members and particularly children, should be afforded the necessary protection and assistance so that it can fully assume its responsibilities within the community.

Recognizing that the child, for the full and harmonious development of his or her personality, should grow up in a family environment, in an atmosphere of happiness, love and understanding,

Considering that the child should be fully prepared to live an individual life in society, and brought up in the spirit of the ideals proclaimed in the **Charter of the United Nations**, and in particular in the spirit of peace, dignity, tolerance, freedom, equality and solidarity,

Bearing in mind that the need to extend particular care to the child has been stated in the **Geneva Declaration of the Rights of the Child of 1924** and in the **Declaration of the Rights of the Child** adopted by the General Assembly on 20 November 1959 and recognized in the **Universal Declaration of Human Rights**, in the **International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights** (in particular in articles 23 and 24 in the **International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights** (in particular article 10)

and in the statutes and relevant instruments of specialized agencies and international organizations concerned with the welfare of children,

Bearing in mind that, as indicated in the Declaration on the Rights of the Child, "the child, by reason of his physical and mental immaturity, needs special safeguards and care, including appropriate legal protection, before as well as after birth",

Recalling the provisions of the Declaration on Social and Legal Principles relating to the Protection and Welfare of Children, with Special Reference to Foster Placement and Adoption Nationally and Internationally; the United Nations Standard Minimum Rules for the Administration of Juvenile Justice (The Beijing Rules); and the Declaration on the Protection of Women and Children in Emergency and Armed Conflict,

Recognizing that, in all countries in the world, there are children living in exceptionally difficult conditions, and that such children need special consideration,

Taking due account of the importance of the traditions and cultural values of each people for the protection and harmonious development of the child,

Recognizing the importance of international co-operation for improving the living conditions of children in every country, in particular in the developing countries,

Have agreed as follows:

Before continuing we should note that within the Preamble are several points which must be considered. As can be seen, there are many attendant documents upon which the Convention bases its goals. However, not all the goals of the Convention are sinister. Indeed, the drafters of the Convention would view all the goals as beneficial to children. But there are a number of statements in the Convention which threaten the family structure, especially among those whose world view differs from that of secular humanism. We will see this more clearly as we proceed.

Is the Convention Pro Family?

For immediate consideration is the fact that the statement confirming the family "as the fundamental group of society and the natural environment for the growth and well-being of all its members and particularly children," seems designed to allay the fears of some that the Convention will eliminate parental rights. However,

when the entire paragraph—and especially the entire document—is considered, we do see a threat to the family.

Notice the remainder of the statement, affirming that the family "should be afforded the necessary protection and assistance so that it can fully assume its responsibilities within the community." What this is saying is that governments should intervene in the family situation in order to assure that the children are being prepared for community service. When governments use the term "assistance," they really mean the imposition of government mandates for proper behavior. Social service agencies are generally used to "assist" families by instructing parents on acceptable practices in raising their children. For those whose world view coincides with that of their government, there is no real problem. Such parents welcome government intervention, perceiving it as one of the "free" benefits of society. Most of these parents are welfare recipients; many are single parents eager for whatever assistance they can receive. And who can blame them? Some welfare recipients are legitimately deserving of financial help; without government assistance they would be destitute. But with government help comes government control.

The problem isn't so acute where genuine needs exist. There are children who need protection even from their own parents. In such cases social service agencies can provide valuable assistance. But when government designs legislation to intrude into every family's business—regardless of need (or just to find out if there is a need)—then families become subject to state regulation for every aspect of their functioning.

Where Is the Love?

No doubt the drafters of the Convention hope that every child will be able to experience a happy childhood. However, to say that the child should be "brought up in the spirit of the ideals proclaimed in the Charter of the United Nations, and in particular in the spirit of peace, dignity, tolerance, freedom, equality and solidarity," misses the mark. What about the spirit of love? How often have children been removed from less than perfect homes by social workers who perceive the external environment of more importance

than the love of the natural parents toward their children? It happens far more often than is realized by the general public.

Children's Rights

Children's rights are alluded to in the Preamble's ninth paragraph, wherein is affirmed the child's need for "special safeguards and care, including appropriate legal protection, before as well as after birth." This is an interesting proposition. Before birth, a child's legal protection can only mean protection from being aborted or injured through the design or carelessness of his parents or others while he is in the pre-natal state. Yet even among the proponents of the Convention there is no protest against the wholesale slaughter of innocents through abortion. In fact, this is one area in which we see how selective governments—whether national or international—can be.

Just because a law is clear in its statement doesn't mean it cannot be "interpreted" to mean something else. The U.N.'s *Bulletin of Human Rights*, #91/2 addresses the issue of protection for the unborn as stated in the Convention. In effect, that protection is nullified through interpretation. In the U.N. *Bulletin*, Philip Alston, professor of Law and Director of the Centre for International and Public Law of the Australian National University, wrote on the legal framework of the Convention:

While recognizing (particularly in the preamble) that the foetus is deserving of appropriate protection, its right to life *per se* is not recognized.

Come again? A foetus is deserving of appropriate protection, but not necessarily of life itself? What sort of doublespeak is this? If a foetus has any rights at all, it seems that its most fundamental right is to life.

The Convention, like all government charters and documents, is more often than not left to interpretation based upon the political climate of the times. So while much of the language of the Convention may seem beneficial to families and to children, the political climate today is essentially based upon the philosophy of secular humanism. Secular humanism, touting its creed of subjective truth and denial of absolute morality can and will allow for the use of all avenues to further its agenda. That agenda has often been

stated as contrary to biblical morality and the absolutes of God's Word as the basis for proper thought and behavior of man.

The last paragraph of the Preamble to the Convention calls for international cooperation for improving the living conditions for children. What can this mean other than U.N. intrusion into domestic affairs?

Under the terms of the Convention, the United Nations will most likely join in the operation to implement the provisions of the Convention in its member states. In the United States, for example, U.N. workers could be directly involved in overseeing the welfare of children in this country. This goes beyond merely advising and offering assistance from a distance.

There is no doubt that children in some countries require intervention in order to protect them from the ravages of war, child slavery, extreme poverty and other evils. This is due primarily to the failure of those countries' leaders to govern properly. While certain social ills do affect children in the United States, our society in general is well equipped to handle those relatively rare situations that do exist. If anything, the United States is in a position to help other nations learn how to govern for the benefit of their citizens. Yet the possibility exists that U.N. workers from other countries may oversee the welfare of our children.

Am I drawing an erroneous conclusion? Knowing the intrusive nature of government and especially the already stated endorsement of "interdependence" rather than "independence" by our government, I don't believe so. Everything in government today is working toward interdependence and surrender of sovereignty to supranational alliances. This is happening on the economic, political, military and societal levels. Scripture warns of the emergence of a supranational alliance with a false religious system which will persecute the saints of God in the last days.

As we delve further into the Convention on the Rights of the Child, we'll see that at the least we should be cautious of any attempt to move control of families and social work beyond the local level. It's bad enough that much control has already been handed over to the state and federal levels. How much worse will it be when international social workers—possessing no regard for the American way of

life—deign to intrude into family affairs. Is it possible that, because of your beliefs that are contrary to those of the internationalist world view, your child will be removed from your care and placed in foster care in a foreign land? This is a distinct possibility under Article 21 (b), which we will be addressing later on.

Let's continue with the Convention's articles:

PART I

Article 1

For the purposes of the present Convention, a child means every human being below the age of eighteen years unless, under the law applicable to the child, majority is attained earlier.

Article 2

1. States Parties shall respect and ensure the rights set forth in the present Convention to each child within their jurisdiction without discrimination of any kind, irrespective of the child's or his or her parent's or legal guardian's race, colour, sex, language, religion, political or other opinion, national, ethnic or social origin, property, disability, birth or other status.

Whenever governments say they shall "ensure" something we must realize that the only way they can do so is to monitor every unit under their jurisdiction—the unit being the family or the individual. In the United States there are already local, state and national laws designed to protect children.

It may be argued that such protections are not afforded children in other nations. That being the case, let the United Nations intrude into those states where it sees the lack of such protections. Let the member states utilize economic sanctions against those states until they do adopt such protections. To draft a treaty such as the Convention on the Rights of the Child means intrusion by foreign states into the affairs of individual sovereign states, to wit: the destruction of sovereignty. Certainly the United States needs no such intrusion.

2. States Parties shall take all appropriate measures to ensure that the child is protected against all forms of discrimination or punishment on the basis of the status, activities, expressed opinions, or beliefs of the child's parents, legal guardians, or family members.

This sounds good. After all, why should a child be discriminated against because of his parents' beliefs and opinions, let alone for other considerations? But "all forms of discrimination" goes further than discrimination by government agencies; it intrudes into personal preferences. It may even be interpreted to mandate the acquiescence of religious organizations to situations contrary to their beliefs. This would affect few organizations beyond those which are adamantly determined to maintain doctrinal purity based upon the Bible as God's inerrant Word. Regardless if one perceives this threat as a reality or not, the possibility for abuse is inherent in the language of this Article. Where co-operation by non-Christian foreigners is concerned we can hardly expect understanding of the need to keep our churches and religious institutions pure. It has already been determined by the U.S. Supreme Court that religious organizations other than churches or their affiliates cannot discriminate in their hiring practices. Why should we think that the U.N. would act any more benevolently than the U.S. government toward religion—especially toward the Gospel?

Article 3

1. In all actions concerning children, whether undertaken by public or private social welfare institutions, courts of law, administrative authorities or legislative bodies, the best interests of the child shall be a primary consideration.

2. States Parties undertake to ensure the child such protection and care as is necessary for his or her well-being, taking into account the rights and duties of his or her parents, legal guardians, or other individuals legally responsible for him or her, and, to this end, shall take all appropriate legislative and administrative measures.

Article 5

States Parties shall respect the responsibilities, rights and duties of parents or, where applicable, the members of the extended family or community as provided for by local custom, legal guardians or other persons legally responsible for the child, to provide, in a manner consistent with the evolving capacities of the child, appropriate direction and guidance in the exercise by the child of the rights recognized in the present Convention.

Again, this sounds altruistic. But it has already been determined by U.N. policy as well as national policy here in the United States that families cannot be considered isolated from their communities. What this means in practical terms is that "other individuals legally responsible" for the child includes social service agencies as well as any other interested parties within the community. Observing the manner in which social service agencies (including juvenile justice courts) are currently "taking into account the rights and duties" of parents, there is little to suggest that parental rights are not subservient to the rights of government agencies. Under civil and criminal law, duties of parents are judged as delineated by the government, not by God.

Article 7

1. The child shall be registered immediately after birth and shall have the right from birth to a name, the right to acquire a nationality and, as far as possible, the right to know and be cared for by his or her parents.

2. States Parties shall ensure the implementation of these rights in accordance with their national law and their obligations under the relevant international instruments in this field, in particular where the child would otherwise be stateless.

The provision to register every child immediately after birth is already being implemented in some areas, even here in the United States. The stated objective, of course, is to ensure the rights of all children. But the potential for abuse far outweighs any perceived benefits. What this would eventually mean is that every individual on the face of the earth will be registered with an international body that will track and guide that individual's life according to that international body's objectives. Even if the registration were confined to a national registry, the implications of a Big Brother government are astounding. Certainly such a registration policy is not needed in the United States.

The overblown propaganda meted out through the media by socialists bent on controlling everyone has left the impression that child abuse is rampant in the United States. While child abuse is a problem, it isn't nearly the problem it's made out to be. There just aren't the

statistics to prove the claim, unless every form of corporal discipline such as spanking is included as child abuse. The current hysteria against spanking has made virtually every parent a potential abuser; it is on this basis that demands for stronger government intrusion into the home are being heard.

Article 8

1. States Parties undertake to respect the right of the child to preserve his or her identity, including nationality, name and family relations as recognized by law without unlawful interference.

There is little to find fault with this Article. It appears to be mainly directed toward abating the horrendous child slavery trade. However, regarding the phrase "without unlawful interference" implies the sanctioning of "lawful interference." Yet there should be no lawful interference into any of these areas. The only way such lawful interference may not be implied is to merely remove the word "unlawful." This would mean that no interference in these areas may be assumed.

Article 9

1. States Parties shall ensure that a child shall not be separated from his or her parents against their will, except when competent authorities subject to judicial review determine, in accordance with applicable law and procedures, that such separation is necessary for the best interests of the child. Such determination may be necessary in a particular case such as one involving abuse or neglect of the child by the parents, or one where the parents are living separately and a decision must be made as to the child's place of residence.

Another good-sounding pronouncement. However, the definition of abuse or neglect should not be based upon an international agency's determination—not even a national or state determination. These definitions should be based upon local mores and customs. Apart from some heathen cultures (which could be dealt with independently through sanctions, etc.), there are no local customs that would allow for genuine child abuse. Certainly in the United States there are no cities, towns or counties where genuine child abuse is sanctioned. But, again, there are those who would outlaw spanking on a global level, claiming it to be child abuse.

Article 15

1. States Parties recognize the rights of the child to freedom of association and to freedom of peaceful assembly.

2. No restrictions may be placed on the exercise of these rights other than those imposed in conformity with the law and which are necessary in a democratic society in the interests of national security or public safety, public order (ordre public), the protection of public health or morals or the protection of the rights and freedoms of others.

What about parental rights to guide their children's associations? This isn't even considered. The abrogation of the right to free association is allowed only by "conformity with the law," and "in the interests of national security or public safety," etc. In other words, the government has more control over the child's associations than do his parents. And should parents attempt to restrict those associations, those parents may find their children removed. At the least, the family may be required to submit to government reprogramming of their beliefs in order to remain intact.

Article 18

1. States Parties shall use their best efforts to ensure recognition of the principle that both parents have common responsibilities for the upbringing and development of the child. Parents or, as the case may be, legal guardians, have the primary responsibility for the upbringing and development of the child. The best interests of the child will be their basic concern.

Veddy interessting! "Both parents have common responsibilities for the upbringing and development of the child." Really? What about the God-ordained order of authority within the family? The father's role or responsibility is not in common with that of the mother, although both are obliged to render whatever service may be necessary to meet their children's needs. But not only does this Article eliminate the God-ordained roles of both father and mother, it mandates that "the best interests of the child will be their basic concern."

Well, quite frankly, sometimes government's definition of the "best interests of the child" (which is open to interpretation) may conflict with the best

interests of the family—or of the family structure as ordained by God.

Not only is this reality neglected, but the state is also mandated to monitor “parents and legal guardians in the performance of their child-rearing responsibilities.” Concluding that parents are generally incompetent in this area, the states must also develop institutions, facilities and services for the care of children taken from their parents:

2. For the purpose of guaranteeing and promoting the rights set forth in the present Convention, States Parties shall render appropriate assistance to parents and legal guardians in the performance of their child-rearing responsibilities and shall ensure the development of institutions, facilities and services for the care of children.

Many parents would not welcome government “assistance” when it comes to learning their responsibilities?

Article 19

1. States Parties shall take all appropriate legislative, administrative, social and educational measures to protect the child from all forms of physical or mental violence, injury or abuse, neglect or negligent treatment, maltreatment or exploitation, including sexual abuse, while in the care of parent(s), legal guardian(s) or any other person who has the care of the child.

What is “mental violence?” Can it be construed to mean parents exerting their wills over the will of their child? Can it mean insisting that children perform certain chores around the house? More likely, can it mean parents training their children to believe in a God who insists that there is only one way for salvation?

None of these scenarios exist beyond the realm of possibility. They are all implemented under communist rule. And considering the communist mindset behind the formation of the United Nations Organization and the drafting of its Charter, there is no reason to believe such abuses of parental rights won’t occur.

What has escaped general consideration in the wake of the Soviet Union’s collapse is that communism is not a Russian ideology; it is an internationalist ideology. Russian or Soviet communism was never meant to continue beyond the point where the nations of the world would be willing to surrender their sovereignty to an

international governing body. Now we can see the design for world government more clearly unfolding with the democratization of the entire world.

While Americans think they’ve won the war against communism through economic superiority, the hidden agenda of international capitalism that has financed communism to this point has determined that all the world’s economies will eventually be in the control of an elite few through multi-national mega-corporations. These mega-corporations are the driving force behind government economic policy and the real force behind such recent coalitions as NAFTA and APEC. I believe there eventually will be revealed a world communist government controlled by super-capitalists. Behind that power will be Satan operating through the anti-Christ.

Article 21

States Parties that recognize and/or permit the system of adoption shall ensure that the best interests of the child shall be the paramount consideration and they shall:...

(b) Recognize that inter-country adoption may be considered as an alternative means of child care, if the child cannot be placed in a foster or an adoptive family or cannot in any suitable manner be cared for in the child’s country of origin;

So it is possible that children may be taken from their parents and shipped off to foreign foster care. This will not only nullify parental rights, but destroy national ties for the children. As to whether or not a child can “in any manner be cared for in [his] country of origin” must rest with the determination of the international governing body. This opens the door for international child-slavery with U.N. sanctions. It certainly isn’t unheard of that people (especially from undeveloped countries) would use positions of power to sell anything or anyone for a profit. Can we trust the altruism of the U.N. to ensure against such abuses?

Article 24

1. States Parties recognize the right of the child to the enjoyment of the highest attainable standard of health and to facilities for the treatment of illness and rehabilitation of health. States Parties shall strive to ensure that no child is deprived of his or her right of access to such health care services.

Suppose a child’s parents want to “deprive” him of certain medical “benefits” such as forced vaccinations or health care procedures contrary to their faith or even their common sense? Sometimes government-granted “rights” interfere with one’s personal desire to act in his own best interests.

2. States Parties shall pursue full implementation of this right and, in particular, shall take appropriate measures:

(a) To diminish infant and child mortality;

Except in the case of abortion, as we’ve seen.

(b) To ensure the provision of necessary medical assistance and health care to all children with emphasis on the development of primary health care;...

(d) To ensure appropriate pre-natal and post-natal health care for mothers;

(e) To ensure that all segments of society, in particular parents and children, are informed, have access to education and are supported in the use of basic knowledge of child health and nutrition, the advantages of breast-feeding, hygiene and environmental sanitation and the prevention of accidents;

(f) To develop preventive health care, guidance for parents and family planning education and services.

Suppose certain “family planning” procedures are contrary to one’s conscience? Too bad.

3. States Parties shall take all effective and appropriate measures with a view to abolishing traditional practices prejudicial to the health of children.

What may be defined as “traditional practices prejudicial to the health of children?” Considering the humanist mindset behind the push for global citizenship, any form of corporal punishment will definitely fall under this category. Corporal punishment is generally regarded by humanists as detrimental to a child’s self-esteem.

Article 26

1. States Parties shall recognize for every child the right to benefit from social security, including social insurance, and shall take the necessary measures to achieve the full realization of this right in accordance with their national law.

Article 27

1. States Parties recognize the right of every child to a standard of living adequate for the child's physical, mental, spiritual, moral and social development.

2. The parent(s) or others responsible for the child have the primary responsibility to secure, within their abilities and financial capacities, the conditions of living necessary for the child's development.

3. States Parties, in accordance with national conditions and within their means, shall take appropriate measures to assist parents and others responsible for the child to implement this right and shall in case of need provide material assistance and support programmes, particularly with regard to nutrition, clothing and housing.

This is pure socialism. And all these provisions rest upon the parents' ability to provide an "adequate" standard of living. But by whose standards? Such a provision leaves open opportunities for abuse against poor families. It's as if poverty is *de facto* evil. Many have grown up in poverty to become solid, productive citizens and, more importantly, children of God. Conversely, wealth has proven a curse for some in these regards. The point is that such stringent government mandates, while offered with good intentions by some, fail to acknowledge the hand of God in everyone's life. He uses the circumstances of life to mold those He has chosen to be vessels of honor. But, then, we really cannot expect the world—especially those who control the world—to understand this, let alone acquiesce to it.

4. States Parties shall take all appropriate measures to secure the recovery of maintenance for the child from the parents or other persons having financial responsibility for the child, both within the State Party and from abroad. In particular, where the person having financial responsibility for the child lives in a State different from that of the child, States Parties shall promote the accession to international agreements or the conclusion of such agreements, as well as the making of their appropriate arrangements.

Essentially, this could mean that a child may be taken from his parents, shipped to a foreign country and never again have contact with them. But the parents will be

required to pay for his or her upbringing until he or she reaches the age of eighteen.

Article 28

1. States Parties recognize the right of the child to education, and with a view to achieving this right progressively and on the basis of equal opportunity, they shall, in particular:

(a) Make primary education compulsory and available free to all;...

(e) Take measures to encourage regular attendance at schools and the reduction of drop-out rates.

Nothing is "free." And compulsory education is an invention of socialism; it is certainly not mandated by the U.S. Constitution or the Bible. Paragraph (e) is especially ominous. Attendance at "schools" means government sanctioned schools. Homes are not "schools." Were the paragraph to read "attendance at a school or home school environment" it would not threaten parental rights.

2. States Parties shall take all appropriate measures to ensure that school discipline is administered in a manner consistent with the child's human dignity and in conformity with the present Convention.

When socialists and humanists speak of "human dignity" for children they essentially mean "no spanking" or discipline that would "demean" the child's "self-esteem."

3. States Parties shall promote and encourage international co-operation in matters relating to education, in particular with a view to contributing to the elimination of ignorance and illiteracy throughout the world and facilitating access to scientific and technical knowledge and modern teaching methods. In this regard, particular account shall be taken of the needs of developing countries.

There's that word "co-operation" again. Does this mean that the U.N. will co-operate with the United States' educational institutions?

Article 29

1. States Parties agree that the education of the child shall be directed to:...

(b) The development of respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms, and for the principles enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations;...

(d) The preparation of the child for responsible life in a free society, in the spirit of understanding, peace, tolerance, equality of sexes, and friendship among all peoples, ethnic, national and religious groups and persons of indigenous origin;

Christians have no problem with friendships among non-believers, or with tolerance of other belief systems. But we cannot fellowship with non-believers. The humanistic influences behind the Convention have no intention of allowing children to be "brainwashed" into believing they must remain separate.

Article 30

In those States in which ethnic, religious or linguistic minorities or persons of indigenous origin exist, a child belonging to such a minority or who is indigenous shall not be denied the right, in community with other members of his or her group, to enjoy his or her own culture, to profess and practise his or her own religion, or to use his or her own language.

No one wishes to deprive children of these things. But the cry among humanists is that the preaching of the Gospel—especially to children—is a deprivation of these rights. What may be the outcome of an international ban against such preaching?

Article 43

1. For the purpose of examining the progress made by States Parties in achieving the realization of the obligations undertaken in the present Convention, there shall be established a Committee on the Rights of the Child, which shall carry out the functions hereinafter provided.

2. The Committee shall consist of ten experts of high moral standing and recognized competence in the field covered by this Convention.

Who will define "high moral standing?" The subjective truths and situational ethics that characterize humanism cannot adequately meet this standard. And those with "recognized competence" are without a doubt psychology-trained social workers and government agents.

WHAT RECOURSE IS THERE?

Interestingly, the Charter of the United Nations does not allow for such deep penetration into domestic affairs of its member states:

