

U.S. Platforms on International Treaties\ Legal Instruments.

Talin Galoosian and Katherine Kruckenberg

Introduction:

On October 24th 1945, the United Nations officially came into existence with the United States as a major signatory to the charter. Two years later, the United States Mission was created by the U.N. Participation Act to help the President and the Department of State in conducting U.S. policy at the U.N. As stated in the Preamble of the Charter, the U.N. seeks to promote peace and security in this world in addition to reaffirming faith in the fundamentals of human rights; and as a major world power, the United States is partially responsible for maintaining the Charter. The political and economic success seen by the United States has been magnificent when looked at in the span of history; however, in our world today, the United States has succumbed to the powers of globalization and technological innovation and no longer is the super power it once used to be. New innovations and economic growth seen by countries such as China show that the world is shifting into a new direction and that the United States can no longer stand as the sole super power. It is important to note that although technology and globalization are determining the future of the world we live in, there is one fundamental problem that technology cannot solve: human rights. The rights of all people, man and woman, have always been seen as a bit of a controversy and to this day remain to be jeopardized by the scourge of war and ideological mentality of specific country-states. The role of the United States is crucial in this fight against crimes towards human rights because although the United States might not be the outstanding economic power it used to be, it functions as a democracy and the people have their right to all freedoms (United States Constitution). In this document, we aim to show the treaties and conventions set forth by the U.N. to ensure a more peaceful outlook on maintaining human rights and the United States stance on said conventions. We can then hopefully analyse the specific reasons as to why the United States (a country based on freedom and the proliferation of human rights) has not signed or ratified many important conventions.

The following are the 16 conventions researched and the U.S. response to each:

YES

CERD – International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination 21 Dec 1965

CCPR – International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights 16 Dec 1966

CESCR – International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights 16 Dec 1966

CAT - Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment 10 Dec 1984

CRCOPSC – Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on the sale of children, child prostitution, and child pornography 25 May 2000

NO

CERDARTICLE 14 – International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, Article 14 21 Dec 1965

OPT. PROT. – Optional Protocol of the Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights 10 Dec 2008

2ND OP – Second Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, aiming at the abolition of the death penalty 15 Dec 1989

CAT ARTICLE 22 -

OP CAT – Optional Protocol to the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment

CEDAW – Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women 18 Dec 1979

CEDAW.OP – Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women 10 Dec 1999

CRC – Convention on the Rights of the Child 20 Nov 1989

CMW – International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of all Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families 18 Dec 1990

CRPD – Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities 13 Dec 2006

CRPD:OP – Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities 12 Dec 2006

CPPED – International Convention for the Protection of all persons from enforced disappearance 20 Dec 2006

Ratifications and Reservations as of April 2009, set forth by the United Nations:

1 . Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide

New York, 9 December 1948 ¹

U.S. Signed 11 Dec 1948, Ratified 25 Nov 1988

2 . International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination

New York, 7 March 1966

U.S. Signed 28 Sep 1966, Ratified 21 Oct 1944

2.a Amendment to article 8 of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination

New York, 15 January 1992

U.S. Not Signed or Ratified

Article 8 of this convention discusses the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination and its function in regards to maintaining the convention. The committee consists of 18 independent human rights experts, elected for four-year terms, with half the members elected every two years. Members are elected by secret ballot of the parties, with each party allowed to nominate one of its nationals to the Committee. The U.S. has yet to ratify and sign this treaty because it has a reservation against the treaty's incompatibility with the Constitution of the United States. More specifically, the treaty's restrictions of freedom of speech and the freedom of assembly is the main reason the U.S. and many other countries have yet to ratify or sign the convention. According to author John Fonte, "in order to comply with the interpretation of this treaty that was created by the NGOs at the NGO Forum, the United States would have to "turn its political and economic system, together with their underlying principles, upside down — abandoning the free speech guarantees of the Constitution, bypassing federalism, and ignoring the very concept of majority rule, since

practically nothing in the NGO agenda is supported by the [U.S.] electorate", stating that these NGOs were "a new challenge to liberal democracy" that contested the principles of individual rights, democratic representation, and national citizenship, along with the contesting the very idea of a liberal democratic nation-state."

*http://www.unhchr.ch/html/menu3/b/d_icerd.htm

*<http://www1.umn.edu/humanrts/CERDConcludingComments2008.pdf>

*John Fonte (2003). "The Future of the Ideological Civil War Within the West". in Shlomo Sharan. *Israel and the Post-Zionists: A Nation at Risk*. Sussex Academic Press. pp. 136–138.

3 . International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights

New York, 16 December 1966

U.S. Signed 5 Oct 1977

3 .a Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights

New York, 10 December 2008

U.S. Not Signed or Ratified

One of the 12 treaties "On which the Administration does not seek Senate Action at this time," according to a the letter released by the Obama Administration via the State Department which outlines it's treaty priorities. As stated in the "Closure of Proceedings and the Adoption of the Report" of this Protocol, the United States was in opposition of both the original and revised protocols:

"The United States noted that it continued to have concerns about a number of provisions and remained sceptical of the need for an optional protocol. It reserved its position on the text overall. While equally important, economic, social and cultural rights were, in a legal sense, fundamentally different. They were to be progressively realized in accordance with available resources and were, on their face, difficult to adjudicate, as reflected in the absence of provisions on remedies and enforcement in the Covenant."

More specifically, the U.S. did not approve the texts of Articles 1, 2 and 4. In addition, the United States opposed the "establishment of a fund, for fear of dangers of linking violations to funds and risking the duplication of UN funds".

*www2.ohchr.org/english/issues/escr/docs/A-HRC-8-7.doc

*<http://www2.ohchr.org/english/bodies/cescr/>

4 . International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights

New York, 16 December 1966

U.S. Signed 5 Oct 1977, Ratified 8 Jun 1992

5 . Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights

New York, 16 December 1966

U.S. Not Signed or Ratified

According to the "Aboriginal Law Bulletin", the United States nor the United Kingdom are parties to the Optional Protocol so Australian lawyers cannot look to their experience within the Human Rights Committee with respect to domestic remedies. However Canada and New Zealand are parties and there are other countries, such as Jamaica, with common law legal systems.

*<http://www.austlii.edu.au/au/journals/AboriginalLB/1993/42.html>

6 . Convention on the non-applicability of statutory limitations to war crimes and crimes against humanity

New York, 26 November 1968 ¹

U.S. Not Signed or Ratified

We can assume the United States pays for its military because it intends to use it as an instrument of national policy. With the deployment of armies come charges of aggression as well as alleged violations of humanitarian law, so no limitations to war crimes and crimes against humanity is favourable for the U.S. agenda.

*http://www.unhchr.ch/html/menu3/b/p_limit.htm

*<http://www.iccnw.org/documents/1stSesPrepComSenatecfr.pdf>

7 . International Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of Apartheid

New York, 30 November 1973

U.S. Not Signed or Ratified

As said by Ambassador Clarence Clyde Ferguson Jr.: "[W]e cannot...accept that apartheid can in this manner be made a crime against humanity. Crimes against humanity are so grave in nature that they must be meticulously elaborated and strictly construed under existing international law". Thus, we can assume that the definition of a crime of apartheid was not severe enough under the jurisdictions of international law at that time.

*<http://www.freedominon.com.pa/phpBB2/viewtopic.php?t=113905&sid=0cabec2eed1639fc6c247fd1436b946a>

*UNESCO:

<http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0003/000312/031289eb.pdf>

8 . Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women

New York, 18 December 1979

U.S. Signed 17 Jul 1980

8 .a Amendment to article 20, paragraph 1 of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women

New York, 22 December 1995

U.S. Not Signed or Ratified

One of the 17 treaties "On which the Administration is supporting Senate Action at this time," according to a the letter released by the Obama Administration via the State Department which outlines it's treaty priorities. It is therefore on the treaty priorities list. The U.S. was active in drafting CEDAW in 1979, and it was signed by President Jimmy Carter in 1980 just prior to leaving office. At that time, however, the treaty was not ratified by the U.S. Senate, a process that requires a two-thirds majority vote. At the urging of President Clinton in 1994, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee (SFRC) passed CEDAW, but as a result of political manoeuvring and opposition from right-wing leaders, it was never voted on by the full Senate. In 2002, the SFRC again voted in favour of CEDAW's passage, but the treaty was again stalled by Republican opposition before the 107th Congress came to an end. In order for the U.S. to ratify CEDAW, the SFRC must again vote in favour of sending it to the full Senate for ratification. The U.S. is the only industrialized country to date that has not ratified CEDAW. In addition, Republicans believe that universal healthcare to women will support abortion.

*Pathfinder International:

http://www.pathfind.org/site/PageServer?pagename=Advocacy_Resource_Fact_Sheets_CEDAW

*United Nations CEDAW:

http://www.bayefsky.com/reports/egypt_cedaw_c_egy_7.pdf

8 .b Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women

New York, 6 October 1999
U.S. Not Signed or Ratified

Same as above.

9 . Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment

New York, 10 December 1984
U.S. Signed 18 Apr 1988, Ratified 21 Oct 1944

9 .a Amendments to articles 17 (7) and 18 (5) of the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment

New York, 8 September 1992
U.S. Not Signed or Ratified

Under Articles 17.7 and 18.5, the United States is in opposition about the expenses of the Committee. The U.S. does not want to be obliged to cover all expenses of its committee member's travels and accommodations to committee meetings.

*United Nations CAT:

<http://www2.ohchr.org/english/bodies/cat/docs/AdvanceVersions/CAT.C.CHL.5.pdf>

*ACLU:

http://www.aclu.org/torturefoia/released/052708/052708_Special_Review.pdf

9 .b Optional Protocol to the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment

New York, 18 December 2002
U.S. Not Signed or Ratified

The United States has not ratified the First Optional Protocol to the ICCPR and did not declare itself bound by article 22 of the Convention against Torture. The First Optional Protocol and article 22 allow the committees responsible for monitoring compliance with the treaties to receive complaints from individuals and organizations, in addition to complaints from other governments. The effect of the US positions, combined with inadequate enforcement at the state level of prohibitions on torture and cruel, inhuman, and degrading treatment, is to deny US citizens and others who allege violations of such treaties any forum in which their grievances can be heard or resolved.

*Human Rights Watch: ACLU

“A Violent Education”

<http://www.hrw.org/reports/2008/us0808/11.htm>

10 . International Convention against Apartheid in Sports

New York, 10 December 1985
U.S. Not Signed or Ratified

Under the Convention, States parties strongly condemn apartheid and undertake to pursue immediately the elimination of apartheid in all its forms from sports. They commit themselves not to permit their sports bodies, teams and individual sportsmen to have contact with a country practising apartheid. States parties agree to: refuse to provide financial assistance; restrict access to national sports facilities, void sports contracts; and withdraw national honours or awards. They also are to deny visas to sports persons representing a country practising apartheid and expel such countries from international and regional sports bodies. No documentable evidence has been found on why the U.S. has not ratified or signed this treaty, but we can presume because the United States uses sport as a national pastime and certain scholarships and money is provided for sports figures and thus the convention is contradictory to the actions and interests of the U.S. United States

citizens follow sports and enjoy national awards and the availability of sports arenas as a type of leisure.

*<http://www.thefreelibrary.com/International+convention+against+apartheid+in+sports+signed+on+16+May...-a04539734>

11 . Convention on the Rights of the Child

New York, 20 November 1989

U.S. Signed 16 Feb 1995

11 . a Amendment to article 43 (2) of the Convention on the Rights of the Child

New York, 12 December 1995

U.S. Not Signed or Ratified

The amendment states: The Committee shall consist of eighteen experts of high moral standing and recognized competence in the field covered by this Convention. The members of the Committee shall be elected by States Parties from among their nationals and shall serve in their personal capacity, consideration being given to equitable geographical distribution, as well as to the principal legal systems.

The U.S. claims that the sovereignty of the nation is at stake at the whims of these eighteen “experts”.

*Office of the U.N. High Commissioner for Human Rights:

<http://www2.ohchr.org/english/law/crc.htm>

*United Nations CRC:

[http://www.unhchr.ch/tbs/doc.nsf/\(Symbol\)/e3027f1f542b5a6ac12569ba00386de9?OpenDocument](http://www.unhchr.ch/tbs/doc.nsf/(Symbol)/e3027f1f542b5a6ac12569ba00386de9?OpenDocument)

11 .b Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on the involvement of children in armed conflict

New York, 25 May 2000

U.S. Signed 5 Jul 2000, Ratified 23 Dec 2002

11 .c Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on the sale of children, child prostitution and child pornography

New York, 25 May 2000

U.S. Signed 5 Jul 2000, Ratified 23 Dec 2002

12 . Second Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, aiming at the abolition of the death penalty

New York, 15 December 1989

U.S. Not Signed or Ratified

The Optional Protocol commits its members to the abolition of the death penalty within their borders, though Article 2.1 allows parties to make a reservation allowing execution for grave crimes in times of war. Capital punishment is a controversial issue, with many prominent organizations and individuals participating in the debate. Arguments for and against capital punishment are based on moral, practical, religious, and emotional grounds. More specifically to the United States, the cost of capital punishment is one of the main controversial issues surrounding the debate. There is no documentable evidence as to why the United States has not signed this treaty but we can make several assumptions. First, it is important to note that the protocol makes it a fundamental human right not to be executed. It prohibits the execution of anyone under the law of a ratifying country. The protocol also implicitly prohibits the reintroduction of the death penalty. Thus, we can assume that the U.S. did not sign the protocol because to this day the U.S. practices the death penalty in most of its states and is in its constitution. Only about thirteen states have repealed the death penalty

beginning with New Jersey in 2007 and we can conclude that the U.S.' choice to refrain from signing has to do with its own political agenda.

*www.unhchr.ch/html/menu3/b/a_opt2.htm

*www.nswccl.org.au/issues/death_penalty/2op.php

13 . International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of their Families

New York, 18 December 1990

U.S. Not Signed or Ratified

As noted in the second session of the Committee on the Protection of the Rights of all Migrant Workers and members of their families, the very fact that a rights-based approach was being discussed was a tribute to the efforts of civil society and trade unions to promote the Convention, and was a reflection of the Convention's slow but sure progress. However, strong challenges were being lodged: for example, the United States Under-Secretary of State responsible for migration had stated that he did not believe that a multilateral rights-based framework on migration was either feasible or achievable.

*United Nations CMW:

<http://www.un.org>

*<http://www.arabhumanrights.org/publications/tbased/cmw/cmw-c-sr-14-05e.pdf>

14 . Agreement establishing the Fund for the Development of the Indigenous Peoples of Latin America and the Caribbean

Madrid, 24 July 1992

U.S. Not Signed or Ratified

The U.S. Observer Delegation pronounced the U.S. government's opposition to the application of self-determination, self-government and the reference term "peoples" to indigenous nations. Striking for its contradiction of U.S. stated policy, the U.S. government's views as expressed before the Working Group basically rejected tribal sovereignty, tribal self-determination, and self-government. Its positions before the UN Working Group on Indigenous Populations contributes further to the sense that the U.S. government is pursuing a mixed policy internally and externally regarding the self-determination of peoples.

*The Center For World Indigenous Studies and The Fourth World Documentation Project:

<http://www.cwis.org/fwdp/International/unwgip93.txt>

15 . Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities

New York, 13 December 2006

U.S. Not Signed or Ratified

The United States played a significant role in developing this treaty, and had a delegation at most of the Ad Hoc Committee meetings providing technical assistance, but the United States has not yet signed it. However, President Obama has come out in favour of the convention and said that he would sign it. Historically the United States has been hesitant to enter into international treaties, and so having the presidential support is critical. Once the President signs it, it will be submitted to the Senate and then the Senate Foreign Relations Committee will consider it. It needs to be approved by a 2/3 majority in the Senate before the President can proclaim its entry into force.

If the United States signs and ratifies the treaty, that means it is allowing itself to be assessed under international standards. So it goes beyond just saying we will abide by these standards. It involves a commitment to participate in the U.N. process and, in fact, it provides an opportunity for the United

States to participate in helping to interpret how the convention is applied, not just in the United States but in other countries as well. The United States issue is the possibility of being governed not only under international standards, but also under the standards of the United Nations and not acting as its own independent entity.

*http://www.ncd.gov/newsroom/testimony/2009/joan_durocher_3-4-09.htm

15 .a Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities

New York, 13 December 2006

U.S. Not Signed or Ratified

This Optional Protocol provides for a complaints mechanism and is ratified separately to the Convention. This mechanism will mean individuals or groups whose government has violated their rights as set out in the Convention can get redress, provided they have exhausted national remedies. This Optional Protocol was put in place to essentially establish a complaints/communications procedure. A complaints or communications procedure allows individuals, groups or their representatives, claiming that their rights have been violated by a State that is a party to a convention or covenant, to bring a communication before the relevant committee, provided that the State has recognised the competence of the committee to receive such complaints. The US has abstained from the treaty, claiming it has no need to sign up because they already have such legislation.

*Child Rights Information Network:

http://www.crin.org/email/crinmail_detail.asp?crinmailID=3136

16 . International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance

New York, 20 December 2006

U.S. Not Signed or Ratified

The treaty is “determined to prevent enforced disappearances and to combat impunity for the crime of enforced disappearance, considering the right of any person not to be subjected to enforced disappearance, the right of victims to justice and to reparation, affirming the right of any victim to know the truth about the circumstances of an enforced disappearance and the fate of the disappeared person, and the right to freedom to seek, receive and impart information to this end”. As stated during the signing ceremony of the convention on the 6th of February 2007, the State Department Press released this documentation of the United States’ stance on the issue:

QUESTION: Did you notice that 57 countries signed a treaty today that would basically bar governments from holding secret detainees and the U.S. did not join?

MR. SEAN MCCORMACK, spokesman for the National Security Council: Yeah. This is -- I understand that there is a Convention for the Protection of All Persons and Enforced Disappearances. And I know -- I have some information on it here, George. I confess I don't have all the details. I do know that we participated in all the meetings that produced the draft. Beyond that, I can't give you specific reasons here from the podium as to why we didn't sign on to it. We've put out a public document that I can give you the citation for afterwards and it explains our reasons for not participating in the draft. But I think just as a general comment, clearly the draft that was put up for a vote or put for signature was not one that met our needs and expectations.

As with many of the non-ratified treaties the United States government officials appointed to these legal instruments leave us with vague answers or even no explanation to their rejection. In this case, Sean McCormack, the representative answering for the National Security Council leaves us with an overly elaborated but unsatisfying answer, and admits that he is unable to supply the public with a specific reason for which the treaty was not accepted.

*<http://dic.academic.ru/dic.nsf/enwiki/4978024>

*http://untreaty.un.org/English/notpubl/IV_16_english.pdf

.

Treaties currently on the Committee calendar on which the Administration does not seek Senate action at this time:

Listed in chronological order from date of submission to the Senate

- 1.) International Labour Organization Convention No. 87 Concerning Freedom of Association and Protection of the Right to Organize, adopted by the International Labour Conference at its 31 st Session held at San Francisco on June 17 ~ July 10, 1948 (Treaty Doc. Ex. S, 81 st Cong., 1st Sess.); submitted to the Senate on August 27, 1949.
- 2.) International Labour Organization Convention No. 116 Concerning the Partial Revision of the Conventions adopted by the General Conference of the International Labour Organization at its first 32 sessions for the purpose of standardizing the provisions regarding the preparation of reports by the governing body of the International Labour Office on the Working of Conventions, adopted by the International Labour Conference at its 45th Session held at Geneva on June 26, 1961 (Treaty Doc. Ex. C, 81st Cong., 2nd Sess.); submitted to the Senate on June 21, 1962.
- 3.) International Labour Organization Convention No. 122 Concerning Employment Policy, adopted by the International Labour Conference at its 48th Session held at Geneva on July 9, 1964 (Treaty Doc. Ex. G, 89th Cong., 2nd Sess.); submitted to the Senate on June 2, 1966.
- 4.) Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, done at Vienna May 23, 1969, and signed by the United States on April 24, 1970 (Treaty Doc. Ex. L, 92nd Cong., 1st Sess.); submitted to the Senate on November 1971.
- 5.) International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, done at New York December 16, 1966, and signed by the United States on October 5, 1977 (Treaty Doc. Ex. D, 95th Cong., 2nd Sess.); submitted to the Senate on February 23, 1978.
- 6.) American Convention on Human Rights, done at San Jose November 22, 1969, and signed by the United States on June 1, 1977 (Treaty Doc. Ex. F, 95th Cong., 2nd Sess.); submitted to the Senate on February 23, 1978.
- 7.) Maritime Boundary Agreement between the United States of America and the Republic of Cuba, done at Washington December 16, 1977 (Treaty Doc. Ex. I-I, 96th Cong., 1st Sess.); submitted to the Senate on January 23, 1979.
- 8.) Amendment to the 1973 Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES), done at Gaborone April 30, 1983 (Treaty Doc. 98-10); submitted to the Senate on October 4, 1983.
- 9.) Protocol II Additional to the Geneva Conventions of 12 August 1949, and Relating to the

Protection of Victims of Non-International Armed Conflicts, done at Geneva June 10, 1977 and signed by the United States on December 12, 1977 (Treaty Doc. 100-2); submitted to the Senate on January 29, 1987.

10.) Convention on Biological Diversity, done at Rio de Janeiro June 5, 1992 and signed by the United States at New York on June 4, 1993 (Treaty Doc. 103-20); submitted to the Senate on November 20, 1993.

11.) Protocol to the Hague Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict and Regulations for Execution, signed by the United States on May 14, 1954 (Treaty Doc. 106-1); submitted to the Senate on January 6, 1999.

12.) Treaty between the United States of America and the Republic of Nicaragua Concerning the Encouragement and Reciprocal Protection of Investment, done at Denver July 1, 1995 (Treaty Doc. 106-33); submitted to the Senate on June 26, 2000.

Conclusion: A Political Analysis on the Obama Administration in comparison to the past

First and foremost, we must note that as of March 31st 2009, the Obama administration decided to seek a seat on the U.N. Human Rights Council, showing the first step in the fighting human rights violations. In doing so, the Obama administration, in our opinion, performed much more admirably in joining the council because it reversed Bush administration policy. As said by Secretary of State Hillary Rodham Clinton, "human rights are an essential element of American global foreign policy". With the addition of the U.S. to the council, there will surely be a positive change since Human Rights activists had been seeking a U.S. seat since 2006 (Bush Administration). Foreign Minister Murray McCully announced that "everybody is just desperate to have the United States and Barack Obama run for the human rights council, and countries are willing to bend over backward to make that happen." This shows the sheer interest in U.S. participation of a Human Rights Council, which is aimed at bettering the world we live in by preventing human rights violations. This shows the difference between the Obama administration and that of the Bush administration wherein the Bush administration refused to join stating that it did not seem like an improvement, thus showing to the U.N. that the U.S. was only thinking for herself. The U.S. Ambassador to the U.N., John Bolton describes the Obama administrations participation in the council as a "theology of engagement at work" and awaits this new era of global security needed in the 21st century. The now troubled legacy of the Bush administration has scarred American politics for life, leaving behind a hopeless country facing an economic melt-down and the only help seen is the new and profound spirit of the Obama administration. Although this new administration has committed itself to an immense workload and re-structuring of a country left in economic peril, one thing is certain: that America and the spirit of the American people have never been at so much of a high and that freedom reigns in the country and this new era and change of leadership will affect the future of the world to come.

In regards to this research on the above 16 conventions, we can conclude that the U.S. has put many important conventions on the so-called "back-burner". Although vague reasoning was given as to why, to understand the complete politics of the United States is a daunting task that cannot even be credibly done by the smartest of political analysts in this world. Many of these conventions have

been set back by the Supreme Court because the court has decided to prioritize conventions, and will look at more U.S. related conventions first. We can assume that the reasons of not signing the above conventions are fair in relation to U.S. Foreign Policy. We feel that the Obama administration is working for the people (in comparison to that of the Bush, in which he was seeking personal benefit), and thus we must put aside the historical mess of the U.S. and now live for a better future. These conventions set forth by the U.N. and its participating countries are in theory made to stop human rights violations and inequality around the globe, but the U.S. is a country based on its constitutions and any tampering or even small word-change is subject to scrutiny and criticism, and for this reason, we feel the U.S. has yet to sign these conventions, because most do not perfectly align with the U.S. constitution. It is only safe to say that with a change in leadership, the U.S.' influence on world politics has reached a new height and the U.S. is beginning to get back in shape. It might take more than the Obama administration to take on this extreme task of fixing a country that is beyond the point of broken, but faith is now restored in the U.S. and foreign policy is finally becoming an integral part of American politics.

Contatti:

Talin Galoosian
University of California, San Diego
tgaloosi@ucsd.edu

Katherine Kruckenberg
University of California, Berkeley
katkruck@berkeley.edu

www.centrodirittiumani.unipd.it
www.unipd.it
www.un.org

