## CEDAW Adv. CP – Aff Answers

### CP Unpopular

#### CEDAW unpopular with republicans, costs political capital like AFF, perm impossible

[Grace Melton](http://www.heritage.org/about/staff/m/grace-melton) **09** Associate for Social Issues at the United Nations – heritage.org

Injustice against women around the world is a reality. It is serious and sometimes even life-threatening. Regrettably, the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women and the CEDAW Committee have done a disservice to the cases of abject discrimination against and mistreatment of women, choosing instead to focus on the advancement of a particular radical social agenda.

It is not the responsibility of the United Nations to set social policy for the United States. Americans rely on their elected representatives in state legislatures and Congress to reflect their values and traditions when legislating domestic Issues such as health care, education, marriage, and family policy.

### No Solvency

#### CEDAW can’t solve – flawed institutions

Lester **Munson 03** former Republican press spokesman for the Senate Foreign Relations Committee http://digitalcommons.wcl.american.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1406

CEDAW is not synonymous with women’s rights, and the Senate should not ratify the treaty. Opponents of CEDAW have pointed to some of its more preposterous consequences, such as the recommendations against Mother’s Day and the promotion of legalized prostitution. These criticisms are certainly valid, but there are substantive reasons to oppose the treaty.CEDAW should not be ratified because: 1) The structure of CEDAW’s institutions are hopelessly and unacceptably flawed, allowing for nondemocratic nations to have influence over American domestic policy; 2) The convention is a distraction from legitimate diplomacy and the real issues confronting women around the world; and 3) CEDAW is an anachronism.

#### CEDAW won’t be ratified – empirically denied – history shows

Lester **Munson 03** former Republican press spokesman for the Senate Foreign Relations Committee http://digitalcommons.wcl.american.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1406

CEDAW was adopted by the United Nations (General Assembly in 1979, and today 170 nations are party to it. President Carter signed the treaty in 1980, but the U.S. Senate has not ratified the treaty. The Democratic controlled Senate failed to ratify CEDAW, not once, but twice—in 1994 and 2002—when it reached the Senate floor.

#### Can’t be ratified due to current policies

Louis **Henkin 95** former president of the American Society of International Law and of the American Society for Political and Legal Philosophy and University Professor emeritus at Columbia Law School http://www.jstor.org/stable/2204206?seq=1

U.S. POLICY ON HUMAN RIGHTS CONVENTIONS The package of reservations, understandings and declarations the United States has been attaching to its ratifications of human rights conventions appears to be guided by several "principles": 1. The United States will not undertake any treaty obligation that it will not be able to carry out because it is inconsistent with the United States Constitution. 2. United States adherence to an international human rights treaty should not effect-or promise-change in existing U.S. law or practice. 3. The United States will not submit to the jurisdiction of the International Court ofJustice to decide disputes as to the interpretation or application of human rights conventions. 4. Every human rights treaty to which the United States adheres should be sub ject to a "federalism clause" so that the United States could leave implementation of the convention largely to the states. 5. Every international human rights agreement should be "non-self-executing." I address each of these "principles" in turn

#### CEDAW does nothing for women’s rights

[GraceMelton](http://www.heritage.org/about/staff/m/grace-melton)09 Associate for Social Issues at the United Nations heritage.org

While women's groups and some politicians have lobbied the Senate to ratify CEDAW, arguing that it would be a useful instrument in championing women's rights at home and abroad, the treaty has rarely made it out of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee for full Senate consideration.[2] The reasons that the Senate has historically rejected CEDAW remain relevant, particularly the challenges it would create for the United States' federalized system of government. Furthermore, the 30 years that have passed since CEDAW's inception continue to illustrate how little the treaty has accomplished to improve women's rights in some of the most oppressive nations that have ratified it, such as Saudi Arabia, and how United Nations "experts" have used the treaty to create new rights and to intimidate countries into adopting radical social policies.

#### Ratification does not promote fem elsewhere – everwhere else has ratified it

[LenoraLapidus](http://www.aclu.org/blog/author/lenora-lapidus), Women's Rights Project & [VaniaLeveille](http://www.aclu.org/blog/author/vania-leveille), 10 Washington Legislative Office http://www.aclu.org/blog/content/ratify-cedaw-because-womens-rights-are-human-rights

Since its adoption by the United Nations in 1979, 186 other nations — almost all the countries of the world — have ratified CEDAW, but the U.S. has not done so. We stand alone with only six other countries — Iran, Somalia, Sudan, Nauru, Palau, and Tonga. It is time for the U.S. to demonstrate its global leadership and take this stand in support of women and girls.