

of individual citizens by establishing an International Criminal Court (ICC), and to establish the principle that the role of the United Nations supersedes national sovereignty.

If these items are individually disturbing, then their combined effect should be alarming.

Redefining the Family and Moral Standards

In a Heritage Foundation report, Patrick Fagan extensively documents how “the social policy agents of the U.N. Committees, working often with radical special interest groups, advise nations to alter the very structure of their societies to decrease emphasis on marriage, the nuclear family, parental authority, and religious beliefs...”. He also shows that, through directives from these UN Committees to participating nations of UN conventions, “mothers are encouraged to find fulfillment by leaving their children in the care of strangers and entering the workforce, and social or legal restraints on sexual activity among adolescents are targeted for removal”.

Fagan states that, “few Americans are aware that agencies within the United Nations system are involved in a campaign to undermine the foundations of society - the two-parent married family, religions that espouse the primary importance of marriage and traditional sexual morality, and the legal and social structures to protect these institutions. Using the political cover of international treaties that promote women’s and children’s rights, the social policy sector of the United Nations...is urging countries to change their domestic laws and national constitutions to adopt policies that ultimately will affect women and children adversely.”

The Heritage Foundation documents how many of the U.N. Committees’ reports urge countries to carry out its agenda, and how it criticizes them when they don’t.

The U.N. committees have:

- requested removal of prohibitions against prostitution, with the goal of eventually “legalizing” it;
- advocated making abortion an international “demand right”, with “unrestricted access for teenagers”, and advocated making the refusal to provide abortion a crime “in all cases, even for reasons of conscience”;
- worked to de-emphasize the role of mothers ;
- worked to undermine parental authority by expanding children’s “rights”;
- Encouraged governments to change religious rules and customs that get in the way.

Specific examples of initiatives underscore the practical

implications of the U.N.’s agenda. For example, a 2000 committee report on Germany, which has “legalized” prostitution, criticizes Germany for not going even further. In another case, Croatia has been criticized for permitting conscientious objection of doctors with respect to the provision of abortion. In 1995, a committee report also rebuked the United Kingdom for permitting parents to remove children from sex education programs. Belarus was criticized for the “prevalence of sex-role stereotypes, as also exemplified by...such symbols as Mother’s Day...”. Regarding Indonesia, the UN committee has “expressed great concern about existing social, religious and cultural norms that recognize men as the head of the family..”, and it pointed out that “it is unclear what steps the Government is proposing to take to modify such attitudes”.

Fagan points out that, “if the U.N. committees have their way, the freedom of parents to raise their own children , to shape their behaviors, and to safeguard their moral upbringing will be a relic of past centuries”.

He reports that UN committees have advocated radical “rights” for minor children, such as:

- the right to privacy, even at home;
- the right to professional counselling, “with or without parental consent or guidance”;
- the right to abortion and contraceptives, “even when that would violate the parents’ ethics and desires”;
- the right to full freedom of expression at home and in school;
- the legal mechanisms to challenge their parent’s authority in court.

A U.N. committee specifically requested that the nation of Belize set up legal structures to permit children to initiate actions against their parents, describing this as an “independent child-friendly mechanism...to deal with complaints of violations of their rights and to provide remedies for such violations”. The committee’s intent to attack traditional values was further illustrated by its statement that, it is “concerned that the law does not allow children, particularly adolescents, to seek medical or legal counseling *without parental consent*, even when it is in the best interests of the child”.

International Criminal Court

To many who have the major media as their sole information sources, it is almost unimaginable that the United Nations could be a vehicle for persecuting Americans at the individual level. However, by accessing un.org, an official internet publication of the United Nations, you can read all about this in their own words. The section on the proposed International Criminal

Court is shocking in its candor.

It is proposed by the U.N. that the ICC will prosecute what the U.N. has judged to be “crimes against humanity”. Interestingly, the listing of “offenses” in this category includes both “rape” and “forced pregnancy”. Since a distinction is made here between the two, it can only be the case that “forced pregnancy” is a reference to an action that denies a woman an abortion. We can therefore see that the Rome treaty to establish the ICC, drafted by delegates from about 160 nations in 1998, and which President Clinton signed, may be used in the future to persecute pro-lifers, people of faith, as well as patriots, and other conservatives.

Alan Keyes states that, “The merest glimpse of the treaty’s language gives a frightening view of what the ‘rule of law’ under an unrestrained International Criminal Court (ICC) will mean. For example, the treaty declares ‘no reservations may be made to this statute’. In other words, countries may not opt out of any part of the ICC’s regime.”

This same U.N. internet document mentioned previously, unabashedly points out that the ICC would operate under a “Principle of Complementarity”, that is, if a national court system would not prosecute these “crimes against humanity”, then the ICC would step in and do this for them. As a result, individual Americans could have judges from China, Libya, or Cuba passing judgement on them for anything the U.N. regarded as an offense.

According to Keyes, “the U.N. announced it needs only *signatures* - not treaty ratification — from 60 countries to begin implementing and enforcing this abomination around the world! Nothing else is needed, in their minds, for it to become international law!” So despite the fact that the U.S. Constitution requires treaty ratification by the Senate, the U.N. appears to be willing to ignore this fact - another sign of its low regard for national sovereignty.

In response to this serious development, and underscoring how real the ICC-globalist threat is, Congressman Ron Paul found it necessary to introduce a measure (HCR 23) calling for President Bush to openly declare that the United States does not intend to ratify or assent to the ICC treaty signed by the Clinton.

International Gun Control

Recently, there was a U.N. Conference on gun control, with the far-reaching title, “The United Nations Conference on the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its

Aspects”. During the gruelling two-week session, which was closed to the press, the U.S. delegation resisted intense international political pressure to permit the adoption of language leading to restrictions on civilian firearm ownership. Although the U.S. fortunately prevailed, according to former U.S. Congressman Charles Pashayan, who served as an at-large delegate at the conference, “this is not the end. This is the opening skirmish of a war.”

At one point, some U.S. delegates were reportedly recommending that the U.S. Delegation walk out of the conference, in particular, after U.S. Undersecretary of State John Bolton’s pro-gun ownership recommendations were ignored by the conference, which responded “very late” in the proceedings with proposals that were even more opposed to the U.S. recommendations. Two of the alarming proposals were a move in the direction of prohibiting firearm ownership, and a move giving gun-control groups an institutional role within the United Nations organization.

The atmosphere of the sessions was set by many of the speakers, who spoke of small arms in dire terms, referencing statistics likely to provoke an emotional response, like the claim that there are 12 weapons in the category of small arms for every person in the world. One delegate alleged that annual fatalities from small arms and light weapons exceed those at Hiroshima and Nagasaki, and therefore they deserved to be treated like “*weapons of mass destruction*”.

The 102 paragraphs of legal-like language associated with the conference’s document may be difficult to fully understand unaided, but Dr. Natalie Goldring of the National Center for Economic and Security Alternatives has summarized some points, which show the extent of the desire that some have for U.N. control, not just of civilian weapons, but also of military and police weapons as well.

Some of these proposals for U.N. firearms supervision are:

- the keeping of comprehensive and accurate records on the manufacture, production, ***holding and transfer*** [emphasis added] of small arms and light weapons within states’ jurisdictions;
- the proper maintenance of such records so that the information in them can be retrieved easily;
- the ensurance of accountability for all weapons owned and issued by the state;
- the ensurance of effective tracing of all weapons owned and issued by the state;

How long will the U.S. continue to resist this agenda? What will happen to our cherished individual rights if we give in to

this pressure? These questions are difficult to answer, but nevertheless, do add attractiveness to the concept of abandoning the United Nations completely.

Do We Still Want to be an Independent Nation?

A fundamental question is raised by some of the above issues: should the United States of America remain a sovereign nation or be subordinated to the control of unelected foreign bureaucrats? This is a stark and urgent question, because it prompts us to ask ourselves, do we really want the United States to continue to exist, or do we want it to be ruled by an international elite?.

Newt Gingrich, a supporter of the World Trade Organization (WTO), gave startling testimony before the House Ways and Means Committee. He said, “We need to be honest about the fact that we are transferring from the U.S. [by choosing to be members of the WTO] at a practical level significant authority to a new organization. This is a transformational moment [for the United States]. I would feel better if the people who favor this would just be honest about the scale of the change. This is not just another trade agreement. We have to be careful, because it is a very big transfer of power. We are not likely to take our authority back”

In light of Mr. Gingrich’s admission of fact, it can be quite shocking to realize that the WTO is a subsidiary organization of the United Nations, and that it is effectively in control of a major part of our government’s policy making - in particular, our trade policy with 141 nations. In other words, our political leadership has transferred the power that our Constitution has vested in elected officials of the federal government, to nonelected international bureaucrats, individuals who are noncitizens, and who have relatively little interest in the well-being of the U.S.

How serious is this trend in Washington? The recent vote on a bill, sponsored by Ron Paul of Texas, to get the U.S. out of the United Nations, was defeated by wide margins, demonstrating that in the critical area of loyalty to American independence, there is little difference between the Democratic and Republican Parties. Eight-five percent (85%) of the Democrats and eighty percent (80%) of the Republicans voted against the measure.

What Can Be Done?

With congress and the presidency firmly in the control of these globalists, and the media strongly aiding their cause, many wonder if the situation is hopeless. What can be done?

Clearly, grassroots voter education has to be a major part of the focus. It is, with little doubt, only because the average citizen remains unaware of the current globalist threat, that our nation’s domestic enemies are able to get elected year after year. We must work to make people understand that officials who wish to incrementally giveaway American sovereignty to the international bureaucracy are the enemies of the United States, and are not fit to hold office. If we fail to draw the line here, then there can be little hope to stop a trend of internationalism which is leading our nation’s government to gradual extinction.

In addition to education, we can also develop the infrastructure for a third-party political movement. Why is this needed?

Because the media dominates the primary process of the major parties, as evidenced by the case of Alan Keyes in the last campaign. Although he outperformed the other candidates by a wide margin, as indicated by post debate polling which consistently gave him an approximately 20% lead over Bush, his name was not mentioned in the post-debate discussion programs of the major media networks. The major media are in a position to play hardball and exploit the public’s ignorance, and they appear to be doing this to extreme degrees. Therefore, there is virtually no possibility for a pro-independence and conservative candidate, like Keyes, to get the nomination of a major party. With a third party, however, conservatives can relatively easily control the nomination process, provided that they choose to participate in the third-party’s state conventions and elect conservative delegates.

If a socially conservative third-party gets its candidates on the ballot, then there is a possibility that they will poll higher-and-higher numbers every election, especially as the public begins to wake up more and more to what is going on. This can have a twofold effect. One, as third party candidates achieve higher-and-higher percentages year-after-year, they can have a greater share of the public campaign funding, permitting more and more people to hear and see the candidate and his issues through radio, television, and print advertisements. Second, as the candidate’s poll numbers increase, it will become harder-and-harder for the candidate to be kept out of the Presidential Debates during the general campaign. Keep in mind, that it was after Ross Perot was permitted to participate in the debates, that he garnered 19% of the vote.

If the public becomes aware of the present crisis, then a third-party candidate can have a real chance again. But for this to occur, there have to be people preparing the political infrastructure by developing the third party apparatus, by working to achieve or maintain its ballot access, and by electing delegates and party officials at the state level who will support and nominate a loyal American candidate at the national level. This

takes participation of many sorts, but is easily in reach if a modest number of individuals have the desire to make it happen. It really requires little sacrifice, in contrast to that which many have made on the battlefield for the very same goal.

We should have no illusions - with congress and the presidency dominated by elected officials of the UN-globalist persuasion, as is clearly evidenced by their stated positions and voting, there is virtually no possibility for our nations survival - unless this trend is reversed!

Please support the America First Party. You may contribute by donating, volunteering, and/or becoming a member. Donations are possible via secure-server on the internet. Please contact us for more information.

America First Party
www.AmericaFirstParty.org
info@americafirstparty.org
1-866-SOS-USA1
1630 A 30th Street #111
Boulder, CO 80301

In Massachusetts:
508-997-3606
P.O. Box 61126
New Bedford, MA 02746

The United Nations



A Growing Threat to Traditional Society

Rarely has there been such a grave threat to the traditional political and moral order as that which is being advanced under the auspices of the United Nations and world peace. All those constitutionalists and patriots, who cherish our national heritage, and are inflamed in their zeal to defend it, by the memory of those who have made the ultimate sacrifice on the battlefields of the world for it, and people of faith, who wish to openly practice their faith and impart it to succeeding generations, should be alarmed and mobilized to resist the United Nations agenda. The UN’s agenda is so pernicious, that it can probably only continue to advance if the American public continues to be unaware of it.

What is being referred to here is not theory, and is easily verifiable from the UN’s official actions and documents. The UN’s efforts extend far beyond providing a forum for the resolution of international disputes, but also involve attempts to restructure the family, by means of the implementation committees of the Convention for the Elimination of all Discrimination against Women (CEDAW) and the Convention for the Rights of the Child (CRC), to promote abortion as a universal right, to promote population and birth control, to disarm ordinary citizens, to extend its jurisdiction to the level