

Jerusalem Post > World News

UN staff allegedly responsible for over 60,000 cases of sexual exploitation

"The charities have a higher than normal obligation to ensure they do everything they possibly can in training, prevention and detection and, critically, prosecution."

By JULIANE HELMHOLD **Published:** FEBRUARY 16, 2018 14:35

Updated: FEBRUARY 18, 2018 09:18



Displaced Iraqi boys enter a tent school set by United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) at Hammam al-Alil camp south of Mosul, Iraq

(photo credit: ARI JALAL / REUTERS)



Listen to this article now

Powered by Trinity Audio

00:00



1.0x

03:06

UN staff have carried out thousands of rapes and other sexual violations against women and children over the last decade, according to a former senior United Nations official.

"There are tens of thousands of aid workers around the world with pedophile tendencies, but if you wear a UNICEF T-shirt, nobody will ask what you're up to," Andrew MacLeod, the former chief of operations at the UN's Emergency Co-ordination Center, said in an interview with british tabloid *The Sun* on Monday, adding that an estimated 60,000 cases of sexual exploitation had been committed over the last decade by 3,300 pedophiles working in the organization.

"Child rape crimes are being inadvertently funded, in part, by United Kingdom tax-payers," he added.

In an interview with CNN last week, MacLeod argued that aid jobs throughout the developed world are used by abusers as an easy way to gain access to vulnerable women and children.

"The National Crime Authority in the United Kingdom has been warning since 1999 that as we crack down on pedophiles in the developed world, the predatory pedophiles are now going to the developing world to get access to children [...] worse, the National Crime Authority has been warning that predatory pedophiles' chosen methodology to gain access to children is to join a children's charity."

"The charities have a higher than normal obligation to ensure they do everything they possibly can in training, prevention and detection and, critically, prosecution," he emphasized.

The scandal comes after a report by Reuters last Friday claimed that Oxfam, one of Britain's biggest charities, condemned the behavior of former staff in Haiti who had allegedly paid for sex while on a mission to help those affected by the 2010 earthquake.

As a reaction to the Oxfam scandal, British aid minister Penny Mordaunt said Britain will cut off aid funding from any organization that does not comply with a new review into charity work overseas and called the acts "utterly despicable," according to Reuters.

"With regard to Oxfam and any other organization that has safeguarding issues, we expect them to cooperate fully with such authorities, and we will cease to fund any organization that does not."

This is not the first time the UN has faced scrutiny over allegations of sexual exploitation by its staff. UN Secretary-General António Guterres admitted that the UN had "wrestled for many years with the issue of sexual exploitation and abuse," as reported by the British newspaper *The Times*.

In an official statement on the UN website, Guterres asserted: "Let us declare in one voice: We will not tolerate anyone committing or condoning sexual exploitation and abuse. We will not let anyone cover up these crimes with the UN flag... Let us make zero tolerance a reality."

Exposing Satanism and Witchcraft

Galatians 4:16
Am I therefore become your Enemy
because I tell you the Truth?

Stop Drop and Roll Will Not Work in Hell



≡ Menu

The United Nations Is Normalizing Pedophilia

June 15, 2017 by Jon Watkins

Hey Folks I have NOT made a deal with the [devil](#) to leave me alone like most of the Limp Wristed Faux preachers have!!

We desperately need your Financial help and your Prayers! If you can spare a few dollars, or a bunch of them, please take a few moments and [donate here](#). My wife and I have been battling the onslaught of the [Enemy since September 2019](#)!

The Deep State Is Free to Prey Upon Your Children. They are the very ones who are protesting and fighting so hard against the President. They know their time is VERY SHORT.

[Revelation 12:12](#) "Therefore rejoice, ye heavens, and ye that dwell in them. Woe to the inhabitants of the earth and of the sea! for the [devil](#) is come down unto you, having great wrath, because he knoweth that he hath but a short time."

[Dave Hodges](#) – The United Nations Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights is sanctioning a sexual revolution that will culminate in the legalization and whole-hearted support of transgenderism but will also support the legalization of [pedophilia](#). As the Deep State is further exposed for their role in Pedogate, we can expect more counterattacks such as the legalization of [pedophilia](#).

[From The New American:](#)

“The United Nations “Human Rights Council,” which counts some of the world’s most ruthless dictatorships as members, sparked global outrage last week by [voting to appoint a UN czar to oversee](#) the normalization of homosexuality and transgenderism around the world.

...According to the [UN’s propaganda service](#), the [discredited UN “Human Rights Council”](#) debated the measure for almost four hours on June 30 before adopting the scheme in a contentious vote. Just 23 member governments and regimes voted in favor of creating the new czar, while 18 voted against and six abstained. The measure was pushed forward by a [tight-knit network of communist and socialist governments in Latin America](#) with [close ties to Marxist terrorist groups, Western globalists, Moscow, and Beijing](#). A number of European governments and other members of the “[LGBT Core Group](#),” which includes Obama and the EU, also played a key role in pushing the scheme from outside the UN “human rights” outfit. “For the first time, work on this issue [normalizing homosexuality and transgenderism] will be effectively institutionalized at the Human Rights Council,” the UN said....”

...“celebrated as a “great step forward for human rights in the United States.” “The measures he advocated here — including new laws to protect people from discrimination — are the same measures that, today, we advocate to governments everywhere.” Ironically, the praise for the child rapist came even as the [UN’s “peace” armies](#) were facing global outrage for systematically raping and sexually exploiting children around the world.

Years ago, I wrote about the fact that NAMBLA was advocating for the legalization of [pedophilia](#). Care to guess who their largest contributor is? Look at the following:

► **Remove Nambla Now**

October 3, 2011 · 

NAMBLA's largest contributor is George Soros. The Libertarian Party supports an Age of Consent reform. Please educate yourself on this.

1 Comment 1 Share

The following is an example of how academics talk about [pedophilia](#). Soon, the practice, much like transgenders terrorizing girls in female restrooms has become the norm.


“Paedophilic interest is natural and normal for human males,” said the presentation. “At least a sizeable minority of normal males would like to have sex with children ... Normal males are aroused by children.”

Some yellowing tract from the Seventies or early Eighties, era of abusive celebrities and the infamous PIE, the Paedophile Information Exchange? No. Anonymous commenters on some underground website? No again.

The statement that paedophilia is “natural and normal” was made not three decades ago but last July. It was made not in private but as one of the central claims of an academic presentation delivered, at the invitation of the organisers, to many of the key experts in the field at a conference held by the University of Cambridge.

Other presentations included “Liberating the paedophile: a discursive analysis,” and “Danger and difference: the stakes of hebephilia.”

Hebephilia is the sexual preference for children in early puberty, typically 11 to 14-year-olds.



The most heinous organization in America is Nambla. Nambla is short for the North American Man-Boy Association and their identifying banner statement is “sex before 8 or it is too late”.

We are on our way in the country to allowing and even encouraging sex with children. The last taboo is being eliminated.

It is now tolerated that creatures with an XY chromosome structure can now enter little girls restrooms, under the guise of being a [transgender](#) and terrorize these girls George Soros style. Your childre are about to become part of a world that they are not equipped to live in.

How long will it be until employees who have sex with children is protected as well when we look at the [transgender](#) issue in bathrooms. No, this is not hyperbole, it is a legitimate concern. The North American Man-Boy Love Association (NAMBLA) begins to figure prominently into this picture. In the past, one of their trademark phrases was “sex before eight, or it’s too late”. This is an obvious attempt to remove the last perverted prohibition from our legal code as well as our societal safeguards to protect our children. Words cannot describe how sick and perverted these people truly are. And before you think that this could never become a reality, please consider that globalist, [George Soros](#), gives money to NAMBLA. If that is not concerning enough for you please realize that [Kevin Jennings](#), an Obama Department of Education official, and a close friend of Hillary Clinton has involvement with this group as well.

NATIONAL REVIEW | POLITICS & POLICY

Tricked by UNICEF

By DAVE KOPEL

October 26, 2007 4:00 PM

Financing of Palestinian terrorism makes for one scary Halloween.

Americans mostly know UNICEF through the “trick or treat for UNICEF” campaigns. The “trick” is on the donors who think that UNICEF is all about helping poor children.

UNICEF has been a major **financier** of Palestinian “summer camps” which encourage children to become suicide bombers. One such camp is **named for Wafa Idris**, a female suicide bomber.

During the late 1990s, UNICEF served as a propaganda organ of the Saddam Hussein regime. Relying solely on Iraqi government statistics, UNICEF and the Saddam government co-authored a report asserting that over a million children in Iraq died because of U.N. sanctions. A map on the first page of the report depicted Kuwait as **a province of Iraq**.

UNICEF is the primary funder for the “Palestinian Youth Association for Leadership and Rights Activation” (**PYALARA**), which UNICEF calls “a major strategic partner in Palestine.” Materials produced by the group are **frequently used** in schools operated by UNICEF.

PYALARA publishes a 16-page newspaper for young people, *The Youth Times* (TYT). It is distributed at Palestinian universities, colleges, community centers, and in the many U.N.-operated schools in Palestinian areas.

The organization claims that its mission is “expanding awareness of one’s roots and identity, environment and culture, as well as of other countries and the world at large.” Yet PYALARA’s products follow the typical line of terrorist propaganda, in which nothing is the fault of the Palestinians, everything is the fault of the Jews, and there is never any effort to consider the merits of Israel’s position on anything.

For example, one PYALARA article was admiring a biography of the recently-deceased terrorist Abu Ali Mustafa.

Mustafa was the head of the terrorist group the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine (PFLP), a branch of Yassir Arafat’s Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO). Mustafa met his demise at the hands of Israeli forces in 2001. In the months before Mustafa’s death, his terrorist group had assassinated an Israeli Cabinet Minister, set off three car bombs in Jerusalem, and carried out many other terrorist attacks.

Earlier, Mustafa and the PLFP had worked with the **Japanese Red Army** (a Communist terrorist group) and slaughtered 24 people at Israel's Ben Gurion International Airport. In 1976, the PFLP hijacked an Air France flight. After refueling in Libya, they flew to Entebbe, Uganda, which was, at the time, ruled by the insane, genocidal tyrant Idi Amin.

The PFLP hijackers, assisted by Amin's army, demanded that five nations release 53 named, convicted terrorists, or else the plane and its passengers would be blown up.

The Israeli Defense Forces carried out a daring raid on the Entebbe airport, killing the hijackers and their Ugandan accomplices, and rescuing all the hostages. The IDF rescue planes touched down at Ben Gurion Airport on July 4, 1976.

One of the few Israeli casualties in the rescue was Lt. Col. **Yoni Netanyahu**, whose brother Benjamin would later become Prime Minister of Israel.

So what did the UNICEF-funded PYALARA have to tell young people about the terrorist mastermind Abu Ali Mustafa? That he was "a political leader...whose history prides his nationalistic activism." Mourning the death of the terrorist, the magazine whined "this is a human being who has a family that awaits his arrival every day." Sympathy would have been better directed to the many innocents who were murdered at Mustafa's direction.

Then, in a lie typical of the Palestinian propaganda press, the PYALARA claimed "the Israelis could have turned to Abu Ali Mustafa to talk peace if peace were what they truly wanted." In truth, Mustafa was always an adamant foe of negotiations, opposed even to Arafat's strategy of going through the motions of peace negotiations in order to distract attention from his devotion for war.

Shortly before becoming head of the PFLP, Mustafa was interviewed by Al-Jazeera. He **stated**: "We believe the conflict and the struggle against Israel is a strategic [principle] that is not subordinated to any consideration." Thus, "We believe the Palestinian people, both in the Diaspora and under occupation, have the right to struggle using all means, including the armed struggle, because we think the conflict is the constant, while the means and tactics are the variables."

Not that UNICEF blames Israel for everything. Bianca Jagger, in her official capacity as "UNICEF ambassador," has toured the Middle East **telling** audiences that the United States is the source of evil in the modern world.

As for the actual needs of children, UNICEF is sometimes an obstacle to progress. For example, UNICEF has been pressuring Guatemala to stop allowing inter-country adoptions. That is, UNICEF would **prefer** a child to languish in a Guatemalan orphanage rather than be adopted by a loving family in the United States.

UNICEF's focus on politics and political correctness has come at the **expense** of saving the lives of the approximately ten million children under the age of five who die each year from preventable causes.

According to UNICEF, the major cause of child poverty in the world is the free market—even though countries with free markets have vastly lower levels of child poverty than do the kleptocratic, statist economies extolled by UNICEF.

A 2003 report **praised** the North Korean dictatorship:

the particular strength of the DPRK's policy framework lies in its comprehensiveness, integration and consistency in addressing the interests of children and women. It has been aligned with the collective production system. The Government has proactively broadened and updated its laws and policies on an ongoing basis, also making an effort to harmonize with international innovations and standards.

Given UNICEF's affinity for the extreme left, it should be no surprise that UNICEF helps **fund** the gun- prohibition lobby in Brazil.

The Executive Director of UNICEF is traditionally chosen by the United States (although nominally appointed by the U.N. Secretary-General). All of the abuses described above took place during the tenure of Executive Director Carol Bellamy, who was **selected** by President Clinton in 1995. In May 2005, President Bush chose former Secretary of Agriculture Ann Veneman as executive director.

While there is no reason to believe that Veneman shares Bellamy's extreme Left agenda, it would be fair to say that she has a long way to go to fix UNICEF. The organization today stills promotes the Brazilian gun prohibition lobby **Viva Rio**, and **funds** the pro-terrorist Palestinian Youth Association for Leadership and Rights Activation as one of its "partners" in what it calls "**occupied Palestinian territory**." UNICEF also "**partners**" with the **Palestinian Red Crescent Society**, which uses ambulances to transport terrorists and their weapons, and whose personnel have participated in suicide bombings.

UNICEF's **executive board** includes China (whose forced abortion policy is neither pro-life, nor pro-choice, nor pro-child) and Bhutan (where **children** are among the many victims of the regime's human rights abuses). UNICEF has doled out **unaccountable** money to the North Korean regime.

Under Veneman, UNICEF is not as bad as it was under Bellamy, and even under Bellamy, the organization performed some good works. However, most people who give money to groups which help children would prefer that *none* of their donations be used to finance terrorism, the destruction of civil liberties, or tyranny.

The good-hearted children who "**trick or treat for UNICEF**" don't know about UNICEF's sordid allies, of course. So instead of simply rejecting the requests of the children, gently explain that you don't want to give money to UNICEF because dictatorships like China help run the organization, and some of UNICEF's money helps pro-terrorism groups. Then, put a dollar (or five, or ten) in a bag of your own, and tell the children that because of their trick-or-treating, you will be giving more money to a different charity (which you can name for them) which uses *all* of it money to help children. And if your child's school is contemplating a UNICEF fundraiser, politely encourage the administration to pick a better charity.

– *Dave Kopel is research director of the **Independence Institute**, in Golden, Colorado.*



UNICEF Wants Your Children

by [William F. Jasper](#) October 31, 1994

In a tumultuous world riven by wars, revolutions, famine, pestilence, and natural disasters, millions of people take comfort and hope in the knowledge that UNICEF, the United Nations Children’s Fund, is on the scene, rendering assistance to the planet’s unfortunates. When the television news cameras bring horrendous scenes of multitudes of starving waifs in Ethiopia and Somalia, and images of hordes of pathetic refugee children suffering from disease and exposure, the heart is overwhelmed. For decades, Americans have opened wide their wallets to help UNICEF provide medicines and immunizations, food, shelter, and development assistance to *les misérables* of the earth. Every year, the UN’s premiere charitable organization can count on compassionate Americans to cough up millions of dollars for UNICEF’s Halloween trick-or-treaters and UNICEF Christmas cards.

An Enormous Fraud

Unfortunately, UNICEF, and its whole carefully crafted benevolent image, is an enormous fraud. What little of the organization’s aid actually gets to the destitute victims it claims to champion is dwarfed by that lost to waste, corruption, mismanagement, and misdirection; and any good achieved is vastly overshadowed by the organization’s long-standing, shameful collaboration with the governments of the most brutal regimes in history.

Take Somalia, for example. In a September 14, 1993 article entitled, “UN’s relief agencies put paperwork before people,” *Chicago Tribune* reporter R.C. Longworth wrote:

UNICEF ... is supposed to look after children in the Third World, especially in devastated countries like Somalia.... But UNICEF, by general consensus, has blown it in Somalia. So has every other UN agency sent to help this nation survive and recover....

In Mogadishu, the capital, the agencies take over the best villas — UNICEF has three — at rents of up to \$5,000 a month. There the staffs live and work behind guarded walls, cut off from the steamy cities around them. It all adds up to a tower of red tape and good intentions from which the UN people look down, uncomprehending, on the alien society around them.

Meanwhile, most of the hard work in the field is done by private non-UN charities such as CARE, Concern, Save the Children Fund, Catholic Relief Services and others.

Among those interviewed by Longworth was Mark Mullan, a former UNICEF officer in the Somali city of Baidoa and an outspoken critic of the record of the UN agencies. In one case cited by Mullan, UNICEF hired a Somali man to oversee the digging of hundreds of wells:

“Contracts were let, mostly to his relatives, and people were paid,” he said, “but these wells just don’t exist. I asked Mogadishu [UNICEF] to investigate this and they sent out the same guy, this Somali, who signed the reports in the first place.”...

Mullan said he knows of no UNICEF senior officer who has ever spent a night outside Mogadishu. “They work in air-conditioned offices and live in air-conditioned villas and, apart from trips to the beach, that’s the sum total of their experience in Somalia.”

PR Machine

This picture of false piety and gluttonous excesses amidst the utter squalor and privation of the world’s most destitute has been confirmed by many other observers, not the least of whom is British journalist (and former UNICEF consultant) Graham Hancock, author of *The Lords of Poverty: The Power, Prestige and Corruption of the International Aid Business*. “Rather than encouraging humility and dedication,” he found, “the world body’s structure seems actively to reward self-seeking behavior and to provide staff with many opportunities to abuse the grave responsibilities with which they have been entrusted.”

“Personnel and associated costs,” notes Hancock, “today absorb a staggering *80 per cent* of all UN expenditures. A body that claims it is struggling tirelessly for world development is thus also an elaborate support mechanism for its own pampered and cosseted staff....” However, thanks to an enormous public relations budget, UNICEF, like other UN agencies, successfully gulls Americans with images of saintly self-sacrifice and global compassion. “Huge sums of our own money are spent on efforts to convince us” of the absolute indispensability of the UN and its “humanitarian” programs, notes Hancock. “During the last decade, funding for the UN’s Department of Public Information (DPI) has grown at twice the pace of the rest of the world body’s budget.”

In its 1993 report, *The State of the World's Children*, UNICEF declared: "It is the responsibility of government to support parents by investing in health and education for all children.... Basic needs will not be met, and basic investments will not be made, by any invisible hand." UNICEF's executive director, James P. Grant (CFR), announced that President Clinton's socialized health rationing plan would greatly improve things for families and children.

In September 1993, UNICEF released *The Progress of Nations*, its first annual report ranking nations by how well they are meeting the basic needs of children. The report said one-fifth of American children live below the poverty line — four times the rate of most industrialized countries. Grant blamed cutbacks in government services (welfare) as the cause of this poor showing. In doing so he ignored more than ample evidence showing that the very conditions he decries are the *result* of the destructive, thoroughly discredited welfare-state policies he espouses.

A leading UNICEF booster is Marian Wright Edelman (CFR), president of the Children's Defense Fund, one of the premiere lobbying organizations for socialist, Big Brother "child" legislation. Writing in UNICEF's *The Progress of Nations, 1994*, Edelman praises the collectivist accomplishments of the Clinton Administration: "Today, with new national leadership, a beginning has been made. We have the Family and Medical Leave Act, an expanded Earned Income Tax Credit to help lower-income working families, a Hunger Relief Act, and a \$1 billion Family Preservation Programme." But that is just the beginning of the grand vision.

At the 1990 World Summit for Children, UNICEF and its comrades successfully lobbied 149 countries into formally committing themselves to establishing national programs of action (NPAs), i.e., programs of centralized planning. "NPAs," says *The State of the World's Children, 1994*, "offer a new, strategic approach to the somewhat discredited but still necessary task of planning for human development. With their focus on children, they can rise above political divisions and survive changes of regime." Discredited, yes. Necessary? Absolute socialist rubbish. At UNICEF, it is clear, little or nothing was learned from the colossal failures of central planning in the USSR and eastern Europe.

Even better, however, than national planning, says UNICEF, is global planning. In *The State of the World's Children, 1994*, UNICEF calls for "sustainable development following the guidelines of Agenda 21, the blueprint for the world's environment agreed to at the 'Earth Summit' in Rio de Janeiro in 1992." *Agenda 21* is a massive document that can be accurately described as a global socialist manifesto dictating centralized micro-management of every iota of the earth's land, air, and water, and every form of human activity.

As enthusiastically explained in *Agenda 21: The Earth Summit Strategy to Save Our Planet, the most accessible version of the document*, "*Agenda 21 proposes an array of actions which are intended to be implemented by every person on earth.... It calls for specific changes in the activities of all people*" (emphasis added). Does that sound vaguely unnerving, like shades of Chairman Mao's revolution? It gets worse. Daniel Sitarz, editor of the work, approvingly describes the global endeavor: "Effective execution of Agenda 21 *will require a profound reorientation of all human society, unlike anything the world has ever experienced* — a major shift in the priorities of both governments and individuals and an unprecedented redeployment of human and financial resources. This shift will *demand* that a concern for the environmental consequences of *every human action* be integrated into individual and collective decision-making at every level." (Emphasis added.)

Naturally, then, UNICEF favors passage of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT), the ponderous, 22,000-page monstrosity marching under the false flag of "free trade." The creation under GATT of the World Trade Organization (WTO), with the authority to override our national and state laws, is exactly the kind of globalist, sovereignty-destroying apparatus the one-world elitists at UNICEF would support.

In its 1994 reports, as in those of previous years, the collectivist bent of UNICEF is seen not only in its proposals but in the "authorities" it quotes: International Planned Parenthood Federation, the Club of Rome, Worldwatch Institute, the Population Council, the Brundtland Commission, OXFAM, the World Bank, the Rockefeller Foundation, Bill Clinton, Al Gore, Boutros Boutros-Ghali, and Paul Ehrlich, to name just a few. If the philosophies and policies associated with those names suit your fancy, then UNICEF is the organization for you.

More Foreign Aid

If there is one issue that poll after poll has shown the American public to be overwhelmingly unified on, it is opposition to foreign aid. However, according to UNICEF, we Americans are downright stingy. In *The Progress of Nations, 1994*, UNICEF criticizes the United States for placing 19th among the 20 major donor countries in terms of its foreign aid allocation as a percent of gross national product. This is a common complaint from an organization that would benefit handsomely from the sacrifices it proposes be levied on others. The UNICEF plan calls upon the U.S. and other industrialized nations to boost foreign aid by an additional \$25 billion annually to achieve "basic human goals by the year 2000." This even though it admits in its 1993 edition of *The State of the World's Children* what many other studies have proven: that private and religious charities — "nongovernmental organizations," or NGOs — do a better job of helping the world's poor. "If the quality as well as the quantity of aid is taken into account," acknowledges the report, "then the balance of this comparison tilts further in the direction of the NGOs."

Where does UNICEF want to send your tax dollars and contributions? In 1993 UNICEF announced that it has plans underway for opening up new offices in Armenia, Azerbaijan, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, and Uzbekistan. It also called for more foreign aid for Russia and the still-communist-run republics of the former Soviet Union. The report quoted Al Gore's call for a "Global Marshall Plan" from his embarrassing 1993 eco-jeremiad, *Earth in the Balance*.

This is not surprising, since UNICEF has been an enthusiastic proponent of aid to totalitarian communist regimes from its very beginning. In fact, it has lavished millions of dollars on some of America's and the Free World's worst enemies. In a May 1975 column entitled "UNICEF Aided Vietnam Fall," *Detroit News* columnist Robert Heintz exposed UNICEF's treachery in aiding the bloody-handed Ho Chi Minh:

Last fall, when you gave the kids trick-or-treat money for UNICEF or ordered UNICEF Christmas cards, did it occur that you, and behind you, the U.S. Government, were bankrolling the Communist takeover of South Vietnam? Well, you were....

UNICEF collected and disbursed a total of \$13,649,433 for its Indochina children's programs.... Of this eight-figure sum, \$8,976,587 went to Communist recipients: \$6,313,130 directly to Hanoi and \$1,975,567 more — via Haiphong and Hanoi, of course — to the Viet Cong.

These UNICEF funds did not reach the Vietnamese children in the form of vaccines, food, or school materials — which came as no surprise to those familiar with the Viet communists' penchant for slaughtering children in the most grisly fashions imaginable, as a form of terrorism to cow peasants into submission. As Heintz reported, the shipments "consisted primarily of trucks, bulldozers, heavy engineer construction equipment, and construction tools and materials," which were "precisely the materials most needed for support of continued warmaking." As Heintz so aptly put it, the UNICEF gambit was "a trick you might say, on the American public; a treat for Ho Chi Minh."

This UNICEF support for a communist dictatorship was not an aberrant example of the agency's distribution of largesse; communist regimes from Afghanistan to Zimbabwe — Cuba, Nicaragua, China, Tanzania, etc. — have been showered with millions upon millions of UNICEF dollars over the decades.

Trick or Treat for Genocide

One of UNICEF's most shameful activities is its assistance to the communist occupational government of Tibet. Since 1949, the communist government of China has occupied the mountain kingdom of Tibet, carrying out a brutal, ongoing campaign of genocide, religious persecution, and cultural destruction that has claimed as many as one million lives. The Beijing regime transferred two-thirds of Tibet's territory to Chinese provinces and has moved in hundreds of thousands of Chinese to replace native Tibetans.

Tears of Silence: Tibetan Women and Population Control, a recent report by the Tibetan Women's Association in Dharamsala, India, details the oppressive depopulation campaign being waged against the Tibetan people — a campaign receiving assistance from UNICEF and the United Nations Family Planning Agency (UNFPA). The Communist Central Committee and State Council responsible for control of population growth have stated, "Family planning should be practiced among minority nationalities to raise the economic and cultural levels of minority areas and to improve national quality." In 1993, the communist Chinese authorities announced a new law, "On Eugenics and Health Protection," designed to "avoid new births of inferior quality and heighten the standards of the whole population." The "threat" of "inferior quality," according to this new law, are those segments of the population coming from "the old revolutionary base, ethnic minorities, the frontier and economically poor areas" — which is to say, the non-Chinese.

In Lhasa, Tibet's capital, the government's 1993 propaganda campaign included street posters with slogans such as, "Control the population and create a civilized nation." Under current policies, report the authors of *Tears of Silence*, "A Tibetan woman must be between the ages of 25 to 35 and married in order to have a child. Tibetan women desiring a second child must wait four years before becoming pregnant again. Women who become pregnant outside of these parameters must have an abortion and/or be sterilized, or face severe social and economic sanctions." The authors cite the testimony of a Tibetan nurse who worked for three years at Lhasa People's Hospital and who verified that "sterilization is done automatically on women delivering their second child at Chinese hospitals."

Throughout the world, UNICEF works with UNFPA, the World Bank, Planned Parenthood, and other anti-natalist organizations to promote abortion "access" and coercive population controls.

Global Child Grabbers

UNICEF's totalitarian advocacy is now at America's doorstep. As the organization noted in June 1994 with the release of *The Progress of Nations*, "The U.S. is the only industrial power that has neither signed nor ratified the 1989 Convention on the Rights of the Child, an international treaty guaranteeing children's rights to survival, protection and development."

Rather, the treaty is a trap, a Trojan Horse using a deceptive appeal of concern for children to conceal a damnable plan to subvert parental rights and transfer increasing authority over child-raising to the collective parenthood of the "global community" — as represented by the UN.

Seen in the light of the terrible potential of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, UNICEF’s slogan, “Every Child Is Our Child,” takes on a very chilling meaning.

ALSO ON THE NEW AMERICAN MAGAZINE

THIS is How Sheriffs Can & Must Protect ...

a day ago • 2 comments

When a Secret Service agent wanted to “visit” a citizen in Coryell County, ...

Mom Loses Custody of Daughter for ...

2 days ago • 5 comments

A Chicago woman lost custody of her daughter after the girl decided she ...


Psyc| Teacl


2 days


When with sc them t

0 Comments


The New American Magazine

 Disqus' Privacy Policy

 Login ▾


 Favorite

Sort by Best ▾



Start the discussion...

LOG IN WITH

OR SIGN UP WITH DISQUS 

Name

Be the first to comment.



UNICEF and Abortion

January 23, 2015 by [Editor](#)

UNICEF denies all involvement with abortion, and does so vociferously. In an official policy statement, UNICEF asserts that it "...has never provided support for abortion and it continues to be the long-standing UNICEF policy not to support abortion as a method of family planning."⁴⁰ This point is repeated regularly. For instance, Executive Director of UNICEF Ireland, Maura Quinn has said, "Here are the facts: UNICEF does not finance abortion or abortion-related activities, nor has it ever done so....UNICEF as an organization does not advocate abortion...the Executive Board as a governing body has never passed any policy that even remotely supports abortion." Or, as Carol Bellamy told a newspaper in India in 2001, "Abortion isn't anything that UNICEF has been involved in. We don't recommend it. We don't engage in it. We don't offer it. We don't tell people they should have it."

However, UNICEF's record on abortion is much more ambiguous, and much more problematic. For instance, UNICEF has endorsed documents, and has participated in the drafting of documents, that call for the legalization of abortion. One such document is the "The United Nations International Guidelines on HIV/AIDS and Human Rights." The document was drafted by the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights and UNAIDS. According to the document's annex, a representative of each UN agency comprising UNAIDS – WHO, UNDP, UNFPA, UNESCO, World Bank, and UNICEF – was present at the drafting of the document. Thus, it can be concluded that UNICEF approves of this document; its name is even on the title page.

The Guidelines document openly asserts that women should have a right to abortion: "Laws should also be enacted to ensure women's reproductive and sexual rights, including the right of independent access to reproductive and STD health information and services and means of contraception, including safe and legal abortion..." It is even suggested that girls should have the right to abortion: "States should ensure that all women and girls of child-bearing age have...access to the available resources to...proceed with childbirth, if they so choose."

Some of UNICEF's most explicit advocacy for abortion rights has come through its involvement in worldwide maternal health campaigns. In 1987, UNICEF joined the Safe Motherhood Initiative (SMI), which was launched at a conference in Nairobi, Kenya. According to its website, the "Safe Motherhood Initiative is a worldwide effort that aims to reduce the number of deaths and illnesses associated with pregnancy and childbirth." However, it became clear from its earliest moments that participants would not shy away from controversy, including controversy surrounding abortion. And perhaps this should come as no surprise, since participants include the International Planned Parenthood Federation, as well as a number of other abortion-providers and abortion-promoters, such as the Population Council (which holds a patent on the abortion drug RU-486). UNFPA is also prominent in the Safe Motherhood Initiative.

One of the ten "Priorities for Safe Motherhood" is labeled "Prevent Unwanted Pregnancy and Address Unsafe Abortion." According to the Safe Motherhood Initiative, this "priority" is based upon the fact that "Unsafe

abortion is the most neglected – and most easily preventable – cause of maternal death.” To address women’s deaths through unsafe abortions, “safe motherhood programmes [should] include client-centered family planning services to prevent unwanted pregnancy, contraceptive counseling for women who have had an induced abortion, the use of appropriate technologies for women who experience abortion complications, and, where not against the law, safe services for pregnancy termination.” An SMI “fact sheet” on unsafe abortion goes one step further than this, calling for the legalization of abortion: “What can be done? Reform laws and policies to support women’s reproductive health and improve access to family planning, health and abortion-related services.” Not only did UNICEF approve of this priority, and of this fact sheet, it seems to have participated in writing it. The fact sheet, itself, states that it was “Prepared by Family Care International (FCI) and the Safe Motherhood Inter-Agency Group (IAG). The IAG includes: the United Nations Children’s Fund (UNICEF), United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA), World Bank, World Health Organization (WHO), International Planned Parenthood Federation (IPPF), and the Population Council.” Thus, according to UNICEF, nations should legalize abortion; they should “reform laws...to...improve access to...abortion-related services.”

UNICEF’s pro-abortion advocacy in the name of maternal health has continued unabated since then. In 1999, UNICEF helped to draft another document, entitled “Reduction of Maternal Mortality,” a Joint WHO/UNFPA/UNICEF/World Bank Statement. In many ways, this document represents UNICEF’s full integration into this maternal health-abortion issue. The text of the statement makes it plain that its sponsors are in total agreement regarding its contents: “This joint statement represents a consensus between WHO, UNFPA, UNICEF, and the World Bank and is an example of the common purpose and complementarity of programmes supported by the four agencies.” The Joint Statement reaches the same conclusion that the Inter-Agency Group of the Safe Motherhood Initiative reached: if unsafe abortions result in maternal deaths, then any effort to combat maternal mortality must address unsafe abortions, at least in countries where abortion is legal: “Complications of unsafe abortion are responsible for a substantial proportion (13%) of maternal deaths. In some parts of the world, one-third or more of all maternal deaths are associated with unsafe abortions. These deaths can be prevented if women have access to family planning information and services, care for abortion-related complications, and, where abortion is not prohibited by law, safe abortion care.”

But the Joint Statement goes even further than this. According to the Joint Statement, access to legal abortion should be expanded: “Availability of services for management of abortion complications and post-abortion care should be ensured by appropriate legislation. Where abortion is not prohibited by law, facilities for the safe termination of pregnancy should be made available.” Who would make these facilities available, and who would fund the creation of these facilities, is not discussed. But another threshold for UNICEF has now been crossed: in the name of maternal health, abortion facilities should somehow “be made available.”

Finally, there is a document produced in 2000 by an NGO called Family Care International. According to Family Care International, the document was written “in consultation” with UNICEF. The document, which includes a quotation from UNICEF Executive Director Carol Bellamy, maps out a strategy for repealing restrictions on abortion. It states that an “Area for Action” is “Changing laws, policies and attitudes that continue to inhibit the full exercise of reproductive and sexual rights.” And what is included in this conception of reproductive and sexual health? “Safe abortion services.”

Thus, in the name of maternal health, UNICEF has made repeated calls for the expansion of abortion services and the recognition of a legal right to abortion. It should also be noted that this approach to maternal health represents a fundamental break from the successful programs of former Executive Director Jim Grant. For instance, it is a controversial approach, an approach that cannot garner widespread, universal acceptance. What is more, it does not focus on the immediate, on the “doable.” If the goal is to save as many women as possible, then UNICEF should focus all of its resources on providing trained birth attendants and emergency obstetric care, and not waste any effort on an indirect, rights-based approach. The Joint Statement, itself, notes that “Only 53% of pregnant women in developing countries deliver with the help of a skilled attendant....Providing skilled attendants able to prevent, detect, and manage the major obstetric complications, together with the equipment, drugs, and other supplies essential for their effective management, is the single most important factor in preventing maternal deaths.” Perhaps the first step in any maternal health crusade should be to ensure that the other 47 per cent of women have trained birth attendants, and to worry about rights and discrimination and social

barriers only after this goal has been achieved. But perhaps even more importantly, by involvement with this maternal health crusade, UNICEF has taken on both the means and ends of groups whose ultimate goal is the right to abortion-on-demand in every country on earth. Through this safe motherhood crusade, UNICEF's integration with UNFPA and IPPF, and other groups like them, grows ever more complete.

As we have seen, one of the reasons cited by the Vatican when it decided to defund UNICEF in November, 1996, was "The participation of UNICEF in the publication of a United Nations Manual advocating the distribution of abortifacient 'post-coital contraceptives' to refugee women in emergency situations." The Vatican was referring to a document entitled "Reproductive Health in Refugee Situations: an Inter-Agency Field Manual." Indeed, this is a deeply controversial document, on many issues. And, indeed, the Manual constitutes another example of the dangers of UNICEF involvement with other UN agencies such as the UN Population Fund.

The very acknowledgements would appear to pose a public-relations problem for UNICEF for, there, UNICEF is joined by Family Health International, Ipas, IPPF, Marie Stopes International, Population Council and UNFPA in endorsing the manual. Family Health International (FHI), initially called the International Fertility Research Program (IFRP), has been involved in devising and testing sterilization techniques and numerous contraceptives and abortifacients, including the Intrauterine Device (IUD), Norplant and the female condom. Ipas manufactures the manual vacuum aspirator (MVA), a suction device that can be used for a number of purposes, including, according to Ipas, early abortions in refugee-like emergency situations. The International Planned Parenthood Federation (IPPF) is the world's largest abortion-provider. Marie Stopes International (MSI) is another major abortion-provider, operating clinics in many developing countries. The Population Council was established to lower worldwide fertility. It advocates for abortion, and, as we have seen, holds the patent for the abortion drug RU-486. It is these groups with which UNICEF associated in the writing of this manual, all of them seminal organizations in the population control movement, and the movement for recognition of abortion as an international human right, as well as organizations that might profit by establishing new markets for their contraceptive and abortifacient products: refugee camps.

What, exactly, does the Refugee Manual say? First, the document suggests a right to abortion: "Implicit in this last condition are the rights of men and women to be informed and to have access to safe, effective, affordable and acceptable methods of family planning of their choice, as well as other methods of their choice for regulation of fertility which are not against the law..." In the parlance of United Nations radicals, "fertility regulation" includes abortion.

The Manual also establishes that relief organizations should distribute "emergency contraceptives" to refugees. The Manual states that: "Key actions to be taken during the emergency to reduce the risk of sexual violence and respond to survivors are...provide a medical response to survivors of sexual violence, including emergency contraception." It also states that: "Copper-bearing IUDs can be used as a method of emergency contraception. This may be appropriate for some women who wish to retain the IUD for long-term contraception....When adopted within five days, an IUD is an effective method of emergency contraception."

It is a scientific fact, a fact now acknowledged by both the UN Population Fund and the World Health Organization (WHO), that emergency contraceptives often operate by blocking already-conceived human embryos from implanting in the uterus. Emergency contraceptives kill human embryos, and are, thus, according to traditional obstetric definitions, abortifacient in nature.

From all of this, it can be concluded that UNICEF is an opportunistic advocate of abortion rights. UNICEF has used the issue of HIV/AIDS to promote abortion. UNICEF has used the issue of maternal mortality to promote abortion. UNICEF has used the issue of refugee crises to promote abortion. And it now appears that UNICEF has accepted the most explicitly pro-abortion element of the United Nations – the Committee on the Convention of the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW) – as a fundamental guide for its own policies and programming. One UNICEF document claims that "the application of CRC and CEDAW principles [are] now the driving forces behind UNICEF's work for children and women..." The document goes on to say that UNICEF depends upon the pronouncements of the Committee, even gives these pronouncements pride-of-place in its own programming. According to UNICEF,

In assessing the country situations of children and women, UNICEF offices are guided by the suggestions and general recommendations of the Committees for CRC and CEDAW. The concerns and specific problems identified by these Committees may point to the need for further study or actions by UNICEF on issues within its mandate. These suggestions and recommendations may also highlight issues and concerns which in the view of the Committees require attention and may warrant a UNICEF programmatic response.

What does the Committee tell nations? The Committee has informed a number of countries that they must legalize abortion or risk falling out of compliance with the Convention. For instance, in 1999, the Committee told Chile that it "...urges the Government to consider a review and amendment of the laws relating to abortion, in particular to provide safe abortion and to permit termination of the pregnancy for therapeutic reasons or because of health, including mental health, of the woman." The Committee also stated that it "...is concerned that, with very limited exceptions, abortion remains illegal in Ireland. Women who wish to terminate their pregnancies need to travel abroad....The Committee urges the Government to facilitate a national dialogue on women's reproductive rights, including on the restrictive abortion laws." The Committee told Colombia that it "...noted with great concern that abortion, which is the second cause of maternal deaths in Colombia, is punishable as an illegal act."

So it is now established that UNICEF talks, often and repeatedly, about abortion. It accepts the policy guidance of abortion advocates. These are important developments in their own right. But what does UNICEF do? What actions does UNICEF take in support of these positions? UNICEF has participated in a number of dubious family planning programs. For instance, on its webpage, the Population Council describes a program in Sierra Leone whereby UNICEF transfers money from UNFPA to national affiliates of Marie Stopes International (MSI) and the International Planned Parenthood Federation (IPPF): "UNICEF is now executing the National Family Planning/Maternal Child Health (MCH) Project, funded by United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA). This program operates through government health centers and posts and also assists NGOs like Marie Stopes Sierra Leone (MSSL) and the Planned Parenthood Association of Sierra Leone (PPASL). Both MSSL and PPASL receive some assistance, including contraceptive supplies, from this project." Thus, UNICEF is involved in ensuring that Marie Stopes and International Planned Parenthood are provided with contraceptives. What is additionally troubling about this project is that MSI and IPPF are both abortion providers, two of the world's largest and most prominent abortion providers. "Both MSSL and PPASL receive some assistance, including contraceptive supplies, from this project." This assistance includes, and therefore is not restricted to, contraceptive supplies. Is it possible that UNICEF helps to transfer money from UNFPA to MSI and IPPF in order to perform abortions? Unless there are specific guidelines in place – and there do not appear to be any – we have no way of knowing.

In the UN Population Fund's 1996 Inventory of Population Projects in Developing Countries Around the World, UNICEF is named as a financial contributor to a "global" program on reproductive health run by the Population Council. According to the Inventory:

This project focuses on four priorities: improving the quality of care in family planning and reproductive health services; managing unwanted pregnancy and preventing the consequences of unsafe abortion; devising new approaches to postpartum care to meet the health and contraceptive needs of the mother and the health of her child; and designing programs that address sexually transmitted diseases, including AIDS. Funded by Ford, SID, MacArthur, Rockefeller, USAID, AusAID, UNICEF, UNFPA, the Government of the Netherlands, and the Population Council. Project duration: 1987-open. Project budget 1996: \$1,109,000.

There are a number of areas of concern with this program. In UN parlance, "reproductive health services" has often included abortion. What is more, "managing unwanted pregnancies" is also routinely used by pro-abortion non governmental organizations as a euphemism for abortion – the proper manner in which to manage an unwanted pregnancy being to terminate it. Could UNICEF actually be funding abortions through this project?

UNICEF also funds a South African organization called loveLife that purportedly exists to fight the spread of HIV/AIDS. LoveLife appears to be held in high regard throughout the United Nations community, including by

UNICEF. In a press release, loveLife itself reports that, in 2000, “loveLife – South Africa’s high-powered national HIV-prevention effort [was] selected by the United Nations and its affiliated international development agencies – UNICEF, UNAIDS and UNDP – as the only organization to be profiled at the official UN World AIDS events at the UN Headquarters in New York.” On its website, loveLife also claims that UNICEF is a prominent financial sponsor of its programs: “Major funding for loveLife is provided by the Henry J. Kaiser Family Foundation, the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, the South African Government and UNICEF.”

As of January, 2003, loveLife provided children with the telephone number for the Marie Stopes International abortion clinics: “Abortion is free at some government clinics and hospitals. Private clinics charge for it. You can get an abortion done at Marie Stopes Clinics, 0800 11 7785 if you are happy to pay for the service.” LoveLife tells children: “You’re pregnant, or you’ve just heard that your girlfriend is. You didn’t plan it, you don’t want it...Remember, it is your right to get counseling. It is your right to get an abortion. If people are unhelpful, don’t get discouraged. Keep trying. You don’t need permission from anybody to have an abortion.” Lovelife also mentions that a girl can have an abortion – a procedure it describes as “a gentle suction” – without telling her parents. Instead, a girl should “Talk to someone – a health worker, a counselor, or someone you can trust.”⁷⁹ After his girlfriend’s abortion, loveLife recommends that a boyfriend should “Help her feel special – even a cup of tea can help! Celebrate together if you want. Wait before you suggest sex and take it easily and gently. Use contraception.”

Finally, loveLife informs girls what they can expect after their abortion: “You will feel a sense of relief. Some people like to do a ritual to end the process – light a candle, plant a flower, write a poem or go for a long walk. If you get depressed, talk to a counsellor or health worker.”

Finally, there is some indication that UNICEF has provided an early abortion device to international aid organizations through its catalogue of goods. According to Ipas, the manual vacuum aspirator it produces has been distributed by UNICEF: Ipas claims that “MVA instruments are also available through the UNICEF Warehouse Catalogue.” The MVA is a multi-purpose device, useful “for treatment of incomplete abortion, induced abortion through 12 weeks LMP, and endometrial biopsy.” Ipas emphasizes just how useful MVAs are for abortion: “Ipas is working to ensure that where medical abortion is offered, MVA is available as an alternative and/or backup method because of the safety and efficacy of the vacuum aspiration technology.” (It should be noted that this website was altered after the Catholic Family and Human Rights Institute reported on this issue. The mention of UNICEF was removed. Also, no manual vacuum aspirator is currently listed in the UNICEF Warehouse Catalogue.)

What should be concluded about UNICEF and abortion? On multiple occasions, UNICEF has endorsed statements calling for the legalization of abortion and for an increase in access to abortion. UNICEF employs the pro-abortion CEDAW Committee as its policy guide. UNICEF has funded a number of programs that may involve abortion.

Life Issues Institute welcomes comments relevant to columns that are civil, concise, and respectful of other contributors. We do not publish comments with links to other websites or other online material.

5 thoughts on “UNICEF and Abortion”

1. Rita hershberger on [August 29, 2018 at 1:38 pm](#) said:

Watching your UNICEF ad on tv about a child is a child. God knew that child before He or She was conceived , but you support abortion , Get off the fence and take a biblical stand.

[Reply ↓](#)

2. Susan Merritt on [September 30, 2019 at 12:09 pm](#) said:

I will never support your organization's Pro-Choice/ Pro abortifacient policies, and do not shop at any businesses that support Unicef. I am ashamed that I have ever done so in the past.

[Reply ↓](#)

3. [Mauricio Mora](#) on [October 13, 2019 at 9:26 pm](#) said:

I used to support Unicef until I found that they have policies favoring abortion, in other words killing human beings in the womb. Another perfect example of a world when the bad disguises as good and the good appears to be bad.

[Reply ↓](#)

4. [Alicia D French](#) on [April 25, 2021 at 10:02 am](#) said:

I have known UNICEF was probably immoral! I have not given to them for decades!! We used to collect pennies at halloween! How appropriate!! I am disgusted how all of these organizations lie so they can make billions of dollars from the death of human babies!! God will have His day eventually! Maybe sooner than we think!!

[Reply ↓](#)

5. Philip Gouge on [August 16, 2021 at 8:34 am](#) said:

I too regret having supported UNICEF in the past when I was unaware of their support for abortion. Sadly, there are a number of charities based here in the UK which I can no longer donate to because they support or facilitate abortion or experimentation on embryos. These include Oxfam, Barnardo's and Cancer Research UK.

[Reply ↓](#)

Leave a Reply

Your email address will not be published. Required fields are marked *

Comment *

SOTN: Alternative News, Analysis & Commentary

Revealing the True State of the Nation

WORLD HELL ORGANIZATION Seeks to End National Sovereignty in the name of "Pandemics"

Posted on [March 4, 2022](#) by [State of the Nation](#)

Submitted by Harold Saive

Negotiations on an international agreement to prevent and combat pandemics have begun, and ratification is set for 2024.

The Pandemic Treaty Under the World Health Organization (WHO)

WORLD HELL ORGANIZATION (WHO) Seeks to End National Sovereignty in the name of "Pandemics"

Negotiations on an international agreement to prevent and combat pandemics have begun, and ratification is set for 2024.

The agreement is based on Article 19 of the United Nations' World Health Organization (WHO) Constitution, which allows the WHO General Assembly to adopt binding agreements for all 194 Member States by a two-thirds majority.

Critics are concerned that the WHO can prescribe binding measures such as lockdowns, mandatory vaccination or the central collection of data under the 'agreement'.

The pact would give the WHO direct power and will undermine national constitutions.

Compliance measures may include economic sanctions. The 'Pandemic Treaty' is **backed by Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation and US billionaire Marcel Arsenault.**

<https://needtoknow.news/2022/03/the-pandemic-treaty-under-the-world-health-organization-who/>

This entry was posted in [Uncategorized](#). Bookmark the [permalink](#).

SOTN: Alternative News, Analysis & Commentary

roudly powered by [WordPress](#).

NEWS

World Health Organization: Abortion is 'family planning'

In Africa, WHO country teams are training doctors to perform abortions, sometimes over their objections, and perhaps even against the law.



Shutterstock.com

Stefano Gennarini

Fri Apr 21, 2017 - 11:48 am EDT

April 21, 2017 (C-Fam) – Governments have long agreed that abortion cannot be a part of family planning. The World Health Organization has gone along with that consensus until now. Recent journal articles by WHO researchers demonstrate the powerful global agency now rejects that consensus.

Women who want to “avoid pregnancy” following government guidelines in the wake of the Zika scare in Latin America “will need family planning services such as contraception and access to safe abortion,” according to one article that goes on to propose “evaluations of the barriers to access, availability, utilization and readiness of contraception, abortion and post-abortion services.”

The statement that abortion is a “family planning service” contradicts what the UN General Assembly has agreed for decades, namely, that “under no circumstance should abortion be promoted as a method of family planning.”

In another paper WHO researchers devise strategies to promote abortion and measure abortion access around the world, setting the stage to help groups that will carry out this work permanently through a network that would report, monitor, and evaluate “uptake and utilization of contraception and safe abortion care services.”

In Africa, WHO country teams are training doctors to perform abortions, sometimes over their objections, and perhaps even against the law.

WHO teams teach “post-abortion care,” which abortion advocates admit was intended as a stepping stone to introduce abortion. WHO staff have admitted this is a necessary step to introduce legal abortion in countries where it is outlawed.

The paper says “restrictive induced-abortion laws” are “barriers,” and decries how WHO country teams had to train doctors to understand their own abortion laws and, implicitly, how many African doctors object to performing abortions.

Another paper appears to advocate giving teens access to abortion inducing drugs, regardless of status of abortion, and that they are helped to use them correctly.

Click “like” if you are PRO-LIFE!

This latest batch of research shows just how important abortion is to WHO as a component of reproductive health. In fact, these papers mention abortion far more than maternal health or family planning or any other aspect of reproductive health.

Abortion is so intertwined with the WHO's reproductive health programmatic agenda that even a new guideline on women with HIV/AIDS contains recommendations to provide women infected with HIV with “voluntary abortion” options as part of an “integrated” reproductive health services model. There is nothing in the guidelines about ensuring that this will not place other women and infants at risk for HIV/AIDS. The guideline also expresses disfavor with laws that require disclosure of HIV/AIDS status to sexual partners on the grounds that “criminalization of non-disclosure, exposure and transmission makes it harder for women to enter into sexual relationships.”

These positions reflect WHO's 2012 technical guidance on safe abortion that advocates a ban on all limits to abortion. The effort is also likely part of the strategy to include access to abortion as a measure of progress on the new UN development goals that make up the 2030 Agenda.

The World Health organization is the “custodian” agency of the indicator on “universal access to sexual and reproductive health-care services, including for family planning, information and education, and the integration of reproductive health into national strategies and programmes.”

Reprinted with permission from C-Fam.

TOPICS

[Abortion](#)[Contraception](#)

TAGGED AS

[Abortion](#)[Contraception](#)[Family Planning](#)[United Nations](#)[World Health Organization](#)

SOTN: Alternative News, Analysis & Commentary*Revealing the True State of the Nation*

ALERT: 10,000% Increase in Cancers Following COVID-19 VaccinesPosted on [August 3, 2022](#) by [State of the Nation](#)

Submitted by Harold Saive

10,000% Increase in Cancers Following COVID-19 Vaccines as Doctors and Scientists Worldwide Sound the Alarm

August 2, 2022

<https://vaccineimpact.com/2022/10000-increase-in-cancers-following-covid-19-vaccines-as-doctors-and-scientists-worldwide-sound-the-alarm/>

Rates of cancer have exploded following the COVID-19 mass vaccination programs, with doctors and scientists all over the world now sounding the alarm.

The COVID-19 mRNA “Vaccines” cause Cancer; here’s the evidence...

by Joel Smalley; Professional Data Analyst – The Exposé

The homologous recombination DNA repair pathway is one of the mechanisms that the body uses to stop your cells turning cancerous in response to environmental stress.

One of the most important components of this pathway is Tumor protein P53 (p53), the “guardian of the genome”. It protects our cells from cellular damage. Under cellular stress, p53 jumps into action, regulating gene expression to control DNA repair, cell division and cell death. It is the most commonly mutated gene in cancer.

In October 2021, two revered scientists, called Jiang and Mei, had a paper published, after peer review, in MDPI, showing that the SARS-Cov-2 spike protein obliterated the DNA repair mechanism in lymphocytes.

OK, so it gets into the nucleus but the official narrative says it doesn’t stay in the body for more than a few hours.

But, a huge study by one of the most respected molecular biology groups in the world at Stanford university⁴ showed that the mRNA (producing the vaccinal spike antigen) was still present and active in the body after 60 days.

Jiang and Mei, quite logically and reasonably, cautioned that the mRNA spike protein would likely have the same effect as the viral spike protein on p53 and therefore cause cancer.

Two months after this revelation was highlighted by my friend, Jikky the Mouse, the Jiang and Mei

paper was retracted due to spurious “expressions of concern” (EOC) about the methods of the study despite them being standard practice.

Moreover, the authors of the EOC were Eric Freed, the head of the US National Institute of Health (NIH) that funded Moderna, the patent holder of the COVID mRNA toxshot⁵ and Oliver Schildgen, the actual editor of the journal that originally accepted the paper! And neither of them declared the conflicts of interest.

Well, despite the retraction, the spike protein circulating in large quantities, in the direct vicinity of the cell nucleus, for elongated periods of time, still has the potential to induce cancer in those cells (ovary, pancreas, breast, prostate, lymph nodes). **These cancers can take years to develop and so it's possible that we don't see much of a safety signal for 5 or 10 years.**

<https://vaccineimpact.com/2022/10000-increase-in-cancers-following-covid-19-vaccines-as-doctors-and-scientists-worldwide-sound-the-alarm/>

This entry was posted in [Uncategorized](#). Bookmark the [permalink](#).

SOTN: Alternative News, Analysis & Commentary

 proudly powered by [WordPress](#).