CPD 54

With over 25 years experience of attending UN meetings I am still shocked when I listen to the rubbish propagated by so many countries. I am reminded of Romans 1:24 where "God gave them over in the sinful desires of their hearts....."

In summary the meeting last week in New York , which I followed on the internet, was the Commission on Population & Development, CPD54. The subject was :

Population, food security, nutrition and sustainable development.

You would think this would be just about food production etc , but you would be wrong. There was a great push on abortion and sexual rights by Finland with 81 countries supporting this. There would have been much threatening and intimidation to get so many countries I imagine.

It is my pleasure to deliver this statement on behalf of the Governments and peoples of 81 countries: Albania, Andorra, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Bulgaria, Canada, Cabo Verde, Congo, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Estonia, Fiji, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Guinea, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lebanon, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malawi, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mexico, Moldova, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, North Macedonia, Norway, Palau, Peru, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Romania, San Marino, Serbia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Timor-Lest, Togo, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Ukraine, United Kingdom and Uruguay as well as my own country Finland.

Ref : <u>https://www.government.nl/documents/diplomatic-statements/2021/04/19/joint-statement-on-gender-equality-and-srhr</u>

While I was attending the Food Summit negotiations in Rome in 1996, a lady in my Church here in Scotland said to my wife, "Why is Peter at a Food Summit, isn't he just anti-abortion." My wife had to explain that hunger and food shortage can be remedied, according to the UN by aborting away all these poor children. The UN does not say these things so bluntly, but here is a sample from Finland from their statement mentioned above.

"Nutrition, food security, sustainable development and sexual and reproductive health and rights are closely related and mutually reinforcing..... Because of these interconnections, an intersectional approach is required to leave no one behind."

To interpret the above statement let me restate it in my words. To get enough food you need sexual immorality and abortion on demand. Too little food is because there are too many poor

people. Because all these issues are related to each other sexual and abortion rights are essential for getting enough food. This is a lie as population growth and economic growth are not related.

There was no outcome document last year due to COVID. The three years prior to that there was also no document as the Trump appointed people on the US delegation ensured that abortion promotion and other nasty ideas were suppressed. So the UN Secretariat, the Population Division, UNFPA and the rich countries were desperate to get a document, to make "progress".

TCC provided excellent input into a consultation held by the UN in February this year, as to why consensus could not be reached at CPD meetings recently.. The intervention can be viewed at : <a href="https://www.un.org/development/desa/pd/sites/www.un.org.development.desa.pd/files/undesa_pd/sites/www.un.org.development.desa.pd/files/undesa_pd/sites/www.un.org.development.desa.pd/files/undesa_pd/sites/www.un.org.development.desa.pd/files/undesa_pd/sites/www.un.org.development.desa.pd/files/undesa_pd/sites/www.un.org.development.desa.pd/files/undesa_pd/sites/www.un.org.development.desa.pd/files/undesa_pd/sites/www.un.org.development.desa.pd/files/undesa_pd/sites/www.un.org.development.desa.pd/files/undesa_pd/sites/www.un.org.development.desa.pd/files/undesa_pd/sites/www.un.org.development.desa.pd/files/undesa_pd/sites/www.un.org.development.desa.pd/files/undesa_pd/sites/www.un.org.development.desa.pd/files/undesa_pd/sites/www.un.org.development.desa.pd/sites/ww

While a document is being negotiated there are many opportunities for UN bureaucrats, UN agencies and different countries to make short speeches. I would tell newcomers to the UN, when I was doing their induction, that you need a brain transplant, you need an unreality UN brain instead of your normal one. Please forgive my very poor Aussie humor ! I usually quote Psalm 2 at this point, "Why do the nations rage ..."

The aims of the UN are breathtaking. I once saw a pull-up banner at the UN which said, "Ban all nuclear weapons." Hard thing to do. The deputy secretary general mentioned another grand plan in her opening statement last week. By 2030 when the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) finish there will be "NO HUNGER OR MALNUTRITION." In Mark 14:7 Jesus said , "The poor you will always have... ". I think Jesus may be right.

The UN is great at dredging up all sorts of exotic people for their meetings. Last week was no exception, we got to hear the Queen Mother of Bhutan give a small intervention. She is a goodwill ambassador for UNFPA, and was of course promoting abortion through sexual and reproductive rights. She wanted to reduce the global gender gap and gender inequality, and raised the specter of unmet contraceptive needs for adolescents. At the end she even mentioned boys and men. This was a little off script. Men are meant to be the root cause of all evil in the world with their oppressive patriarchy. My wife does not let me get very far with any oppressive anything.

Perhaps the most farcical comment came from a lady called Christine Gould. She was advocating for young people to have a "seat at the table". She claimed their brain were more open. I would say their brains are half empty and they might need some more life experience. She wanted young people to be on the Boards of Directors all around the world. I expect some share-holders may have other ideas.

Many countries were complaining about discrimination against women, Ecuador even came up with gender-based climate change. I have no idea what that is.

There is usually a bit of sniping by certain countries. The delegate from Afghanistan said the Taliban was very bad. Syria did not like their neighbors. Turkey did not like the way Syria was behaving and all the refugees they had forced out.

Of particular interest to me is Japan. I worked for eleven years for a Japanese multinational company in Melbourne and visited that country several times. After WW11 General MacArthur gave them abortion on demand as he thought they would never be able to feed themselves. Now Japan has the lowest fertility rate in the world. You cannot immigrate to Japan and get citizenship unless you are of Japanese origin. So, they have some temporary workers but that's all. The Japanese demographic lady mentioned their ageing population, people were living longer and healthier. She wanted a special category to record people 100 years old and older. They never say that perhaps they need a few more babies!

The Mexican delegate banged on about teen pregnancy, wanted comprehensive sexuality education (lesson in depravity). Lots of condoms and other contraceptives (this never works). But then she hit on a good point, excessive alcohol consumption by the young. I was once in Inverness, Scotland, and met a lady who ran a crisis pregnancy center. I asked if the pregnant teenagers she saw used contraceptives. She said they were usually too drunk to know anything about anything.

There were some good interventions from some NGOs. Franciscans International even quoted Genesis 1:28 and was very pro-population growth. However, the Intersectional Feminists wanted sexual and reproductive health and RIGHTS.,.,

The final document was not too bad, only four references to sexual and reproductive health, ten references to gender, and five references to the family. The sovereignty paragraph was good :

OP2. Also reaffirms the sovereign right of each country to implement the recommendations of the Programme of Action or other proposals in the present resolution, consistent with national laws and development priorities, with full respect for the various religious and ethical values and cultural backgrounds of its people, and in conformity with universally recognized

international human rights;

After the adoption of a "consensus " document at the UN different delegations make reservation and interpretive statements. The statement by the Holy See was excellent as usual. They lamented no reference to family sensitive policies. Then went on to mention that sexual and reproductive health care etc, does not include abortion of abortifacient products Also gender was just biology, only male and female.

As usual Egypt gave a good pro-life reservation as well as Brazil. Sadly Australia (land of my birth) gave a terrible reservation. Very pro-abortion and anti-sovereignty. This is sad as their Prime Minister is a believing Christian, but diplomats just do their own thing. The UK (my adopted country) was very pro-abortion, They were also pushing sexual rights, comprehensive sexuality education the LGBTQI..... and even sex workers. They want inclusivity but never mention men.

I have often wondered why the rich countries, at the UN, are so negative about the family. I remember one African delegate saying to me, "You Europeans must hate your parents." Now during the recent lock down, I have been watching some good people on YouTube. One of these is Dr. Thomas Sowell. He is an African American conservative, with a Ph D in economics. In one of his quotes, he said that ultra-left wing politicians despise the nuclear family, especially the law abiding, God fearing ones who work hard, and do not rely on government assistance. If everyone was like this, we would not need all those left wing extremist politician who want to interfere in our lives. I thought this was a very perceptive observation by Dr. Sowell, I would recommend you watch some of his interviews.

Peter Smith

Representing at the UN

As a final thought I would like to share the statement by Dr Rebecca Oas of C-Fam, very nice effort.

Oral Statement of the Center for Family and Human Rights (C-Fam) at the 54th Session of the Commission on Population and Development

Chairperson,

Access to food and good nutrition is one of the most basic needs of every human being. As population has increased, so too has agricultural innovation to ensure that a sufficient supply of food can be generated. However, distributing that food presents challenges, and these have been exacerbated by the pandemic of the last year.

This is a pressing topic, and worthy of the attention of the CPD. Nevertheless, it is troubling that several times in recent years, the Commission has failed to reach consensus, and the same controversial issues that strained the process to the breaking point are reemerging yet again and threatening to prevent an agreed outcome on a topic on which there is much room for agreement.

The concept of "sexual and reproductive health and rights" or SRHR has never been adopted nor defined by the General Assembly, and to the extent that it has been defined, it includes elements that have also been repeatedly been rejected by the General Assembly, such as a right to abortion.

Chairperson,

To the extent that SRHR contains uncontroversial elements, there already exists widespread agreement. Reducing maternal mortality has been a high priority from ICPD to the MDGs to the SDGs, and progress is being made to ensure safe childbirth around the world, albeit more slowly than we would wish. To that end, nutrition is a key component, as maternal anaemia is a critical risk factor for maternal deaths. For children in the first thousand days of life, which begins in the womb, good maternal nutrition supports healthy pregnancy and subsequent breastfeeding to ensure every child has a healthy start to life.

We hear much about unmet needs for family planning, yet the main reasons for such "needs" are not lack of access, but concern about side effects, personal opposition, or a low perceived risk of pregnancy. But when an unmet need for food exists, it is far more likely to be a matter of access and cost, and not the result of a personal choice.

We urge the Commission to maintain its focus on this year's theme, especially during this difficult time in global history, and resist seeing another opportunity for consensus lost due to needless controversy. Thank you.