

The Lion of Judah Embassy

305A Halsey Street Suite pH3
County of Kings, NY 11216
(718) 573-0723 • e-mail: ewf1937@aol.com
Office of the International Secretariat

The Right Honourable Kofi Annan
Secretary General
United Nations General Assembly
New York [10017], New York
Telephone: (212) 963-1234
Telefax: (212) 963-4879

August 19, 1998

We are incorporated and registered with the Department of State in the City of New York as **the Conquering Lion of Judah Mission, Inc.** and are known simply as **the Lion of Judah Mission, Inc.** a non-profit, 501C3 church organization. However, in addition to this, we as an indigenous people have recognized and implemented our right to autonomy and self-determination according to "The Drafted Declaration Of The Rights Of Indigenous Peoples" E/Cn. 4/Sub. 2/1994/2/Add.1 (1994) and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights as adopted and proclaimed by the General Assembly of the United Nations Organization on 10th December 1948. Furthermore, we who have been the victims of racial discrimination, slavery and economic oppression during the Ethiopian Holocaust (1530-1930) and before have declared ourselves as a people of Rastafari as an Ecclesiastical and Constitutional Sovereignty.

The following is a copy of our Declaration of Sovereignty of the Dominion of the Lion of Judah, after the Order of Melchizedek which we submit to the UNO and member states for recognition of our Ecclesiastical and Constitutional Sovereignty:

The undersigned persons, representing the Rastafari people of the Lion of Judah Mission, the Imperial Dominion of the King of kings named "**Dominion of the Lion of Judah, after the Order of Melchizedek**", an ecclesiastical state organized and based upon the ancient heritage and principles of Melchizedek, H.I.M. The First Haile Sellassie, the King of kings of Ethiopia, the Elect of GOD, constituting persons of many lands and nations, having been the subject of religious and commercial persecution and harassment, do hereby come together to

declare their desire and intent to formalize their procreative sovereign government and nation, independent of outside influence, to guide and protect the people of the Lion of Judah.

The Sovereign Nation of the Lion of Judah shall be built upon a constitution describing and setting forth the rights and liberties of its people. The Lion of Judah shall be governed by a congress, to be known hereafter as the House of Elders. The undersigned persons shall constitute the initial members of the House of Elders until such time as a formal election may be held as directed under the constitution. The Lion of Judah, its foundation being the preservation of Freedom, Privacy, and the Individual Safety of its people shall exist perpetually. The people of the Lion of Judah, as the people of other nations and lands, have increasingly been obstructed and prevented from carrying on and developing profitable and worthwhile commercial enterprise. Governments of most nations in these times of technological advancement and economic unrest, have persisted to lay down legislation and laws including unlawful and non-representative taxation on their peoples. Such Governments have lost sight of their primary purpose, and the basic insights and intents of their founders.

The Lion of Judah, shall possess no boundaries, shall set forth and insure its people of certain inalienable rights and shall at all times, be subject to the influence and direction of its people as guaranteed by the Constitution of the Lion of Judah. Therefore, we the undersigned representatives of the people of the Lion of Judah, assembled in general meeting, do hereby, in the name and by the authority of the people, solemnly publish and declare, that the Lion of Judah is a free and independent Sovereign Nation, absolved and absent of any and all allegiances, and that all political connections between the Lion of Judah and all nations, is and ought to be dissolved, and that as an independent Sovereign Nation, has full power to levy spiritual war in order to bless its enemies, conclude peace, contract alliances, establish commerce, and to do all other acts and things which independent nations may of right do.

Please feel free to call us at (718) 573-0723 and/or e-mail us at: lionofjuda@hotmail.com if you have further questions or comments concerning any matter contained in this letter. Please send us a written response from your office to this letter so that it may be filed as receipt of our communiqué. Thank you in advance for your understanding and cooperation in these matters.

In Truth,



H.H. Ras **Iadonis**, OHIMS
Heir of GOD in Christos
Envoy Extraordinaire/
Ambassador Plenipotentiary

Part Two.

The full text of a copy of the Letter of Opinion is set out (below):

The Right Honourable Kofi Annan

Secretary General

United Nations General Assembly

New York [10017], New York

Re: Letter of Opinion to:

Ecclesiastical and Constitutional Sovereignty;

UDHR, adopted and proclaimed December 10, 1948;

"The Drafted Declaration Of The Rights Of Indigenous Peoples"

E/Cn. 4/Sub. 2/1994/2/Add.1 (1994); and the Montevideo Convention,

Uruguay on December 26, 1934

Dear Secretary General:

Whereas, the Undersealed President, under Section 2.0 et seq. of the Governmental Constitution of the Dominion of Lion of Judah, after the Order of Melchizedek sealed July 23, 1991, has full, Sovereign and vested power and authority to enter into treaties by signature, ratification, adherence and accession thereby binding the Dominion of Lion of Judah, after the Order of Melchizedek and its Sovereign Citizens;

Brief Discussion of Certain Legal Issues.

Ecclesiastical sovereign states such as the Dominion of the Lion of Judah, after the Order of Melchizedek, are in a category peculiar to themselves. By definition, secular rules of nations adopted by custom in international law are not always strictly applicable to those states which are ecclesiastical in nature. Much the same way a benefice is defined by the Vatican in the case of a diocese, the Dominion of the Lion of Judah, after the Order of Melchizedek's spiritual territory and citizens have defined themselves.

It is intended for purposes of this Letter of Opinion and Notice that the Dominion of Lion of Judah, after the Order of Melchizedek be treated as a Sovereign Ecclesiastical "State" with full "political existence of the state independent of recognition by other states" as expressly stated in the Convention on Rights and Duties of States, 49 Stat. 3097, T.S. 881, 165 L.N.T.S. 19, 3 Bevans 145, done at Montevideo, Uruguay on December 26, 1934 which states at Articles 2 and 3:

"The federal state shall constitute a sole person in the eyes of international law."

"The political existence of the state is independent of recognition by other states. Even before recognition the state has the right to defend its integrity and independence, to provide for its conservation and prosperity, and consequently to organize itself as it sees fit, to legislate upon its own interests, administer its services, and define the jurisdiction and competence of its courts."

This portion of the Letter of Opinion is devoted to resolving whether the Dominion of the Lion of Judah, after the Order of Melchizedek is an ecclesiastical sovereignty when recognized international legal principles are applied to the question. No attempt has been made to exhaustively cover this subject. As time proceeds this portion of the Letter of Opinion will be supplemented and amended so as to provide a more comprehensive treatment of the subject matter. Please be patient.

The 1933 Montevideo convention on the Rights and duties of States in Article I relates:

"The State as a person of international law should possess the following qualifications:

1. a permanent population,
2. a defined territory
3. a government; and
4. a capacity to enter into relations with other States."

It has been recognized internationally that the first three criteria correspond to the three elements formulated as the "Drei-Elementen-Lehre" posited by Georg Jellinek at the end of the nineteenth century. [See Akehurst's *Modern Introduction to International Law*, Seventh Revised Edition, (1997) at pp. 75-90].

Defined Territory

"The control of territory is the essence of a state." [Akehurst, *supra* p. 76] Most legal scholars on this issue recognize as a watershed case the Island of Las Palmas case [RIAA II 829, at 839 (1928), See also P.C. Jessup, *The Palmas*

Island Arbitration, AJIL 22 (1928), 735-752; R. Lagoni, Palmas Island Arbitration EPIL 2 (1981, 223-224; Harris CMIL, 173-183.]

During the litigation of this case, Judge Huber noted the following on the concept of territorial sovereignty:

"Territorial sovereignty . . . involves the exclusive right to display activities of a State. This right has a corollary duty: the obligation to protect within the territory the rights of other States, in particular their right to integrity and inviolability in peace and war, together with the rights which each State may claim for its nationals in a foreign territory. Without manifesting its territorial sovereignty in a manner corresponding to circumstances, the State cannot fulfill this duty. Territorial sovereignty cannot limit itself to its negative side, i.e. to excluding the activities of other States; for it serves to divide between the nations the space upon which human activities are employed, in order to assure them at all points the minimum of protection which international law is the guardian."

Scholars have at times disagreed what manner of evidence is required in order to demonstrate territorial sovereignty. For example Akehurst aptly points out

"[O]ccasionally a state leases part of its territory to another state, this is in effect a temporary of sovereignty, because the state to which the territory is leased can exercise full sovereignty over the territory as long as the lease remains in force.. Part of the British colony of Hong Kong is held by the United Kingdom under a lease from china which is due to expire in 1997 when Hong Kong is returned under an agreement reached by the two countries in 1984. Similarly, Portugal agreed in 1987 to return Macau to "China in 1999." [Akehurst, supra at p. 158; C. Rumpf, Territory Lease, EPIL 10 (1987), 507-509; A.D. Hughes, Hong Kong, EPIL II ((1995), 870-873.]

By parity of analysis to the Dominion of the Lion of Judah, after the Order of Melchizedek, the requirement of consistent control of a defined territory is met in accordance with the initial Shashemani "land grant" of 1948 (there have been various others) to the Ethiopian Diaspora scattered in the west through the Ethiopian World Federation, Inc. This year 1948 corresponds to the year in which the State of Israel came into being as a sovereign entity for the Jewish people who, according to their history, suffered persecution and dispersion amongst the peoples of Europe as have the Ethiopian Diaspora of African peoples since 1530 AD, the beginnings of the Ethiopian Holocaust (1530-1930). It must also be noted that on 10th December 1948, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights was adopted and proclaimed by the General Assembly of the United Nations. These three events are significant in our claim to Sovereignty, both Ecclesiastical as well as Constitutional.

As is pointed out in Part One of this Letter of Opinion, the Dominion of the Lion of Judah, after the Order of Melchizedek came into being before Melchizedek met Abram at Salem. The numerous references to the everlasting nature of the Dominion bear witness to this Biblical fact. Furthermore, the references of the Dominion, Kingdom and Priesthood being one without:

1) Temporal boundaries (i.e. from generation to generation)

and without

2) Geographic boundaries (i.e. from sea to sea) underscores the ancient and modern existence of the Dominion of the Lion of Judah, after the Order of Melchizedek. In the alternative, however, anticipating criticism from purely secular critics, the Dominion of the Lion of Judah, after the Order of Melchizedek's inheritance from the unchallenged sovereign owner and only internationally recognized Emperor of Ethiopia, H.I.M. Haile Sellassie I, the Father of Modern Africa, documented in Part One above, clearly meets the "defined territory: criteria set out above.

Population.

The requirement of population is tied to that of territory. Contrary to popular myth, the size of the population need not be significant. In the case of Somalia for example, large numbers of uncounted [i.e. no census] nomads is not a bar to statehood. [See, D. Orlow, *Of Nations Small: The Small State in International Law*, Temple ICJL 9 (1995), 115-140; J. Crawford, *Islands as Sovereign Nations*, ICLQ 38 (1989), 277 et seq.]

"The size of the population, as well as the size of the territory, may be very small. This raises the problem of so-called mini-states which have been admitted as equal members to the United Nations. The Vatican City, the government of which is the Holy See, the administrative centre of the Catholic church, is a special case. In spite of its small population, the Vatican (or Holy See) entertains diplomatic relations with many other states, has concluded international agreements and joined international organizations (but it is not a UN member)." [Akehurst, *supra* at p. 76.]

Because of the prohibition of numbering the people appearing in the Books of Samuel in the Old Testament, no census of citizens within the Dominion of the Lion of Judah, after the Order of Melchizedek has been taken. At this point it is difficult to estimate the number of members in the Dominion, for to do so would require one to estimate the number of people who first believe in and recognize H.I.M. Haile Sellassie I's Melchizedekian role as King of the everlasting Kingdom of Salem (also known as Jerusalem), and his role as High Priest after the Most High God. The Old Testament however speaks at many times of the Sons and Daughters of the Most High who follow His commandments, statutes and judgments. In any event, the sheer number of people who have requested citizenship and Dominion of the Lion of Judah, after the Order of Melchizedek passports during the past five years certainly satisfies the requirement of a defined population within the Dominion, irrespective of where each citizen chooses to make their home.

Ecclesiastical sovereign states such as the Dominion of the Lion of Judah, after the Order of Melchizedek, are in a category peculiar to themselves. By definition, secular rules of nations adopted by custom in international law are not always strictly applicable to those states which are ecclesiastical in nature. Much the same way a benefice is defined by the Vatican in the case of a diocese, the Dominion of the Lion of Judah, after the Order of Melchizedek's spiritual territory and citizens have defined themselves.

Government

The effective control by a government (in exile) over a territory and population is the third core element, and one which is perhaps easiest to handle for purposes of the Letter of Opinion. Clearly the "Declaration of Sovereignty" and "Constitution", as well as the forthcoming Acts, i.e. the "Banking Act of 1993", "Insurance Act of 1993" and "Companies Act of 1993" (according to the Ethiopian calendar year) which will be reproduced all as amended and supplemented demonstrate a stable and peaceful political organization founded upon Biblical principles exists unchallenged.

The capacity to enter into relations with other states, being the last criterion in the Montevideo Convention and also found in the Restatement (Third) of the American Law Institute is equally satisfied by the history of the Dominion provided in Part One of this Letter of Opinion.

Correspondence concerning this Notice of Accession may be directed to the Office of the President, the Dominion of the Lion of Judah, after the Order of Melchizedek, at:

Yours Respectfully,

Office of the President

Dominion of the Lion of Judah Embassy

By: _____/s/_____ [L.S.]

H.H. Ras Iadonis, OHIMS

President

[Sovereign Seal of Office of President]

Thus, by any reasoned definition, it can hardly be argued that the Dominion of the Lion of Judah, after the Order of Melchizedek lacks any capacity to enter into relations with other States. The portion of the Montevideo Convention set out in each of the letters [i.e. Article 3] indicates that all States recognize the "political existence of a State" is completely independent of any recognition issue.

Recognition versus Non-Recognition.

Each reader of this Letter of Opinion will no doubt confront the issue of "recognition" or "lack of recognition" during any investigation of the Dominion of Lion of Judah, after the Order of Melchizedek. Some experts will state recognition is unnecessary. Some will argue recognition [whether de jure or defacto] has already occurred, and others will argue the United States and United Kingdom no longer recognize any nation officially. The question is, what is the truth concerning the international community's views toward this contentious issue?

"The question of the legal effects of recognition has given rise to a bitter theoretical quarrel. According to constitutive theory, advanced in particular by Anzolotti and Kelsen, a state or government does not exist for purposes of international law until it is recognized; recognition thus has a constitutive effect in the sense that it is a necessary condition for the 'constitution (that is, establishment or creation) of the state or government concerned. . . The constitutive theory as opposed to the declaratory theory according to which recognition has no legal effects; the existence of a state or government in question is a question of pure fact, and recognition is merely an acknowledgement of the facts. If an entity satisfies the requirements of a state objectively, it is a state with all international rights and duties and other states are obliged to treat it as such." . . . The prevailing view today is that recognition is declaratory and does not create a state. This was already laid down in the Montevideo convention of 1933 on the Rights and Duties of States and has also been taken up in Article 12 of the Charter of the Organization of American States: 'The political existence of the State is independent of recognition by other States. Even before being recognized, the State has the right to defend its integrity and independence'. . . .

A refusal to recognize is sometimes based on a belief that a new state or government is not in effective control of a territory which it claims, but a refusal to recognize can also be based on other factors; for instance, the United States at one time refused to recognize foreign governments simply because it disapproved of them; in the eyes of the United States, recognition was a mark of approval. The United Kingdom on the other hand usually recognized all governments which were in actual control of their territory, without necessarily implying any approval of such governments. Because non-recognition of foreign governments has been used as a mark of disapproval, recognition of foreign governments has sometimes been misinterpreted as implying approval, even in cases where no approval was intended. In order to avoid such misinterpretations, some states have adopted the policy of never recognizing governments (although they continue to grant or withhold recognition to foreign states). This policy originated in Mexico, where it is known as the Estrada

Doctrine . . . [I]n 1977 the Department of State Bulletin noted that: 'in recent years US practice has been to de-emphasize and avoid the use of recognition in cases of changes of governments and to concern ourselves [instead] with the question of whether we wish to have diplomatic relations with the new governments. In 1980 the British Foreign Secretary announced that the United Kingdom also would adopt this policy. . . We have therefore concluded that there are practical advantages in following the policy of many other countries in not according recognition to governments. Like, them, we shall continue to decide the nature of our dealings with regimes which come to power unconstitutionally in light of our assessment of whether they are able . . . to exercise effective control of the territory of the state concerned, and seem likely to continue to do so. [See, House of Lords Debates, Vol 408, cols 1121-2, announcement made on 28 April 1980." [Akehurst, supra, at p. 83, 84,86 (emphasis added)]

One final point concerns the Helsinki Act of 1975 and the Charter of Paris of 1990 concerning the related principle of self-determination. In these conventions, the European Community and its member states agreed and affirmed:

"their readiness to recognize, subject to normal standards of international practice and political realities in each case, those new states which, following historic changes in the region, have constituted themselves on a democratic basis, have accepted appropriate international obligations and have committed themselves in good faith to a peaceful process and negotiations." [See, Charter of Paris for a New Europe, ILM 30 (1991), 190-228; Guidelines on the Recognition of New States, op. cit. At 1487.

The nature of the Dominion and Kingdom of the Dominion of Lion of Judah, after the Order of Melchizedek clearly meets the standards of promoting peace set out above. Furthermore, the Dominion of Lion of Judah, after the Order of Melchizedek's desire is to enter into and maintain peaceful processes and negotiations. Nowhere throughout the world is the Dominion of Lion of Judah, after the Order of Melchizedek at odds with any other nation; disagreements not being within the nature of its Constitution and foundation as an ecclesiastical sovereignty.

Based upon the foregoing it is beyond cavil that the Dominion of Lion of Judah, after the Order of Melchizedek is a foreign state within the spirit and intention of international law. Whether the United States, United Kingdom or other superpowers decide to enter into diplomatic relations with the Dominion is of no significance concerning the issue of political existence. While such a relationship of peaceful diplomatic relations with the United States and the United Kingdom, among other superpowers is strongly hoped for, such an eventuality is squarely in the hands of the Most High, the Almighty GOD and His Messiah.

Biblical Perspective on Recognition.

One final note must be discussed concerning a Biblical perspective on the issue of recognition. What has been discussed above has been analyzed from primarily a secular angle. A critical question that has not been discussed thus far is: "How many nation states have recognized the historical truth of the Holy Bible

including the creation of the Dominion of Lion of Judah, after the Order of Melchizedek as an everlasting Dominion, Kingdom and Priesthood? This is perhaps the best bell weather concerning the recognition of the Dominion of Lion of Judah, after the Order of Melchizedek. Political reasons which are self-serving will always abound when the issue of recognition of an ecclesiastical sovereign dominion and kingdom are discussed.

Exhibit "A" found immediately below sets out the agreement of States concerning rights of inhabitants of the world to associate together based upon strongly held religious beliefs. No international agreement is more pertinent to the Dominion of Lion of Judah, after the Order of Melchizedek than the "Declaration on the Elimination of all Forms of Intolerance and of Discrimination based on Religion or Belief, ensealed in 1982 by many nation states."

Part Three and Conclusion

As was stated at the beginning of this Letter of Opinion, the author reserves the right to supplement and amend this Letter of Opinion when deemed necessary. No reader should rely upon anything contained in this Letter of Opinion, it being a better course of action for all interested readers to retain appropriate independent legal counsel to advise them of each issue of significance. No telephone calls will be taken by the author concerning any matter contained in this Letter of Opinion.

All inquiries and comments must be telecopied to 718-573-0723, or e-mail lionofjuda@hotmail.com before they will be calendared for response. Please plan on at least three weeks before delivery of any response to any such inquiry, question or comments.

May the Peace That Passes All Understanding
Prosper Each of You and Your Families
By: The the Dominion of Lion of Judah Embassy

-----[L.S.]

By: Ras Iadonis, OHIMS
Envoy Extraordinaire and Ambassador Plenipotentiary
of the Lion of Judah Embassy

Exhibit "A"

DECLARATION ON THE ELIMINATION OF ALL FORMS
OF INTOLERANCE AND OF DISCRIMINATION
BASED ON RELIGION OR BELIEF,

G.A.RES. 55 (XXXVI 1981), 21 I.L.M. 205 (1982). *

The General Assembly,

Considering that one of the basic principles of the Charter of the United Nations is that of the dignity and equality inherent in all human beings, and that all Member States have pledged themselves to take joint and separate action in co-operation with the Organization to promote and encourage universal respect for and observance of human rights and fundamental freedoms for all, without distinction as to race, sex, language or religion,

Considering that the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the International Covenants on Human Rights proclaim the principles of nondiscrimination and equality before the law and the right to freedom of thought, conscience, religion and belief,

Considering that the disregard and infringement of human rights and fundamental freedoms, in particular of the right to freedom of thought, conscience, religion or whatever belief, have brought, directly or indirectly, wars and great suffering to mankind, especially where they serve as a means of foreign interference in the internal affairs of other States and amount to kindling hatred between peoples and nations,

Considering that religion or belief, for anyone who professes either, is one of the fundamental elements in his conception of life and that freedom of religion or belief should be fully respected and guaranteed,

Considering that it is essential to promote understanding, tolerance and respect in matters relating to freedom of religion and belief and to ensure that the use of religion or belief for ends inconsistent with the Charter of the United Nations, other relevant instruments of the United Nations and the purposes and principles of the present Declaration is inadmissible,

* Adopted by the United Nations General Assembly without a vote on November 25, 1981.

Convinced that freedom of religion and belief should also contribute to the attainment of the goals of world peace, social justice and friendship among peoples and to the elimination of ideologies or practices of colonialism and racial discrimination,

Noting with satisfaction the adoption of several, and the coming into force of some, convention, under the aegis of the United Nations and of the specialized agencies, for the elimination of various forms of discrimination,

Concerned by manifestations of intolerance and by the, existence of discrimination in matters of religion or belief still in evidence in some, areas of the world,

Resolved to adopt all necessary measures for the speedy elimination of such intolerance in all its forms and manifestations and to prevent and combat discrimination on the ground of religion or belief,

Proclaims this Declaration on the Elimination of All Forms of Intolerance and of Discrimination Based on Religion or Belief:

ARTICLE 1

1. Everyone shall have the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion. This right shall include freedom to have a religion or whatever belief of his choice, and freedom, either individually or in community with others and in public or private, to manifest his religion or belief in worship, observance, practice and teaching.

2. No one shall be subject to coercion which would impair his freedom to have a religion or belief of his choice.

3. Freedom to manifest one's religion or beliefs may be subject only to such limitations as are prescribed by law and are necessary to protect public safety, order, health or morals or the fundamental rights and freedoms of others.

ARTICLE 2

1. No one shall be subject to discrimination by any State, institution, group of persons, or person on grounds of religion or other beliefs.

2. For the purposes of the present Declaration, the expression "intolerance and discrimination based on religion or belief" means any distinction, exclusion, restriction or preference based on religion or belief and having as its purpose or as its effect nullification or impairment of the recognition, enjoyment or exercise of human rights and fundamental freedoms on an equal basis.

ARTICLE 3

Discrimination between human beings on grounds of religion or belief constitutes an affront to human dignity and a disavowal of the principles of the Charter of the United Nations, and shall be condemned as a violation of the human rights and fundamental freedoms proclaimed in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and enunciated in detail in the International Covenants on Human Rights, and as an obstacle to friendly and peaceful relations between nations.

ARTICLE 4

1. All States shall take effective measures to prevent and eliminate discrimination on the grounds of religion or belief in the recognition, exercise and enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms in all fields of civil, economic, political, social and cultural life.

2. All States shall make all efforts to enact or rescind legislation where necessary to prohibit any such discrimination, and to take all appropriate measures to combat intolerance on the grounds of religion or other beliefs in this matter.

ARTICLE 5

1. The parents or, as the case may be, the legal guardians of the child have the right to organize the life within the family in accordance with their religion or belief and hearing in mind the moral education in which they believe the child should be brought up.

2. Every child shall enjoy the right to have access to education in the matter of religion or belief in accordance with the wishes of his parents or, as the case

may be, legal guardians, and shall not be compelled to receive teaching on religion or belief against the wishes of his parents or legal guardians, the best interests of the child being the guiding principle.

3. The child shall be protected from any form of discrimination on the ground of religion or belief. He shall be brought up in a spirit of understanding, tolerance, friendship among peoples, peace and universal brotherhood, respect for freedom of religion or belief of others, and in full consciousness that his energy and talents should be devoted to the service of his fellow men.

4. In the case of a child who is not under the care either of his parents or of legal guardians, due account shall be taken of their expressed wishes or of any other proof of their wishes in the matter of religion or belief, the best interests of the child being the guiding principle.

5. Practices of a religion or beliefs in which a child is brought up must not be injurious to his physical or mental health or to his full development, taking into account article 1, paragraph 3, of the present Declaration.

ARTICLE 6

In accordance with article I of the present Declaration, and subject to the provisions of article 1, paragraph 3, the right to freedom of thought, conscience, religion or belief shall include, inter alia, the following freedoms:

- (a) To worship or assemble in connection with a religion or belief, and to establish and maintain places for these purposes;
- (b) To establish and maintain appropriate charitable or humanitarian institutions;
- (c) To make, acquire and use to an adequate extent the necessary articles and materials related to the rites or customs of a religion or belief;
- (d) To write, issue and disseminate relevant publications in these areas;

(e) To teach a religion or belief in places suitable for these purposes;

(f) To solicit and receive voluntary financial and other contributions from individuals and institutions:

(g) To train, appoint, elect or designate by succession appropriate leaders called for by the requirements and standards of any religion or belief;

(h) To observe days of rest and to celebrate holidays and ceremonies in accordance with the precepts of one's religion or belief;

(i) To establish and maintain communications with individuals and communities in matters of religion and belief at the national and international levels.

ARTICLE 7

The rights and freedoms set forth in the present Declaration shall be accorded in national legislation in such a manner that everyone shall be able to avail himself of such rights and freedoms in practice.

ARTICLE 8

Nothing in the present Declaration shall be construed as restricting or derogating from any right defined in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the International Covenants on Human Rights.

Exhibit "B"

CONVENTION ON RIGHTS AND DUTIES OF STATES,

49 Stat. 3097, T.S. 881, 165 L.N.T.S. 19, 3 Bevans 145 *

ARTICLE 1

The state as a person of international law should possess the following qualifications: a) a permanent population; b) a defined territory; c) government; and d) capacity to enter into relations with the other states.

ARTICLE 2

The federal state shall constitute a sole person in the eyes of international law.

ARTICLE 3

The political existence of the state is independent of recognition by the other states. Even before recognition the state has the right to defend its integrity and independence, to provide for its conservation and prosperity, and consequently to organize itself as it sees fit, to legislate upon its interests, administer its services, and to define the jurisdiction and competence of its courts.

The exercise of these rights has no other limitation than the exercise of the rights of other states according to international law.

ARTICLE 4

States are juridically equal, enjoy the same rights, and have equal capacity in their exercise. The rights of each one do not depend upon the power which it possesses to assure its exercise, but upon the simple fact of its existence as a person under international law.

ARTICLE 5

The fundamental rights of states are not susceptible of being affected in any manner whatsoever.

* Done at Montevideo, Uruguay, on December 26, 1933; entered into force on December 26, 1934.

The following states are parties: Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, United States, Venezuela.

ARTICLE 6

The recognition of a state merely signifies that the state which recognizes it accepts the personality of the other with all the rights and duties determined by international law. Recognition is unconditional and irrevocable.

ARTICLE 7

The recognition of a state may be express or tacit. The latter results from any act which implies the intention of recognizing the new state.

ARTICLE 8

No state has the right to intervene in the internal or external affairs of another.

ARTICLE 9

The jurisdiction of states within the limits of national territory applies to all the inhabitants.

Nationals and foreigners are under the same protection of the law and the national authorities and the foreigners may not claim rights other or more extensive than those of the nationals.

ARTICLE 10

The primary interest of states is the conservation of peace. Differences of any nature which arise between them should be settled by recognized pacific methods.

ARTICLE 11

The contracting states definitely establish as the rule of their conduct the precise obligation not to recognize territorial acquisitions or special advantages which have been obtained by force whether this consists in the employment of arms, in threatening diplomatic representations, or in any other effective coercive measure. The territory of a state is inviolable and may not be the object of military occupation nor of other measures of force imposed by another state directly or indirectly or for any motive whatever even temporarily.

ARTICLE 12

The present Convention shall not affect obligations previously entered into by the High Contracting Parties by virtue of international agreements.

ARTICLE 13

The present Convention shall be ratified by the High Contracting Parties in conformity with their respective constitutional procedures. The Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Uruguay shall transmit authentic certified

copies to the governments for the aforementioned purpose of ratification. The instrument of ratification shall be deposited in the archives of the Pan American Union in Washington, which shall notify the signatory governments of said deposit. Such notification shall be considered as an exchange of ratifications.

ARTICLE 14

The present Convention will enter into force between the High Contracting Parties in the order in which they deposit their respective ratifications.

ARTICLE 15

The present Convention shall remain in force indefinitely but may be denounced by means of one year's notice given to the Pan American Union, which shall transmit it to the other signatory governments. After the expiration of this period the Convention shall cease in its effects as regards the party which denounces but shall remain in effect for the remaining High Contracting Parties.

ARTICLE 16

The present Convention shall be open for the adherence and accession of the States which are not signatories. The corresponding instruments shall be deposited in the archives of the Pan American Union which shall communicate them to the other High Contracting Parties.

RESERVATIONS

The Delegation of the United States of America, in signing the Convention on the Rights and Duties of State, does so with the express reservation presented to the Plenary Session of the Conference on December 22, 1933, which reservation reads as follows:

The Delegation of the United States, in voting "yes" on the final vote on this committee recommendation and proposal, makes the same reservation to the eleven articles of the project or proposal that the United States Delegation made to the first ten articles during the final vote in the full Commission, which reservation is in words as follows:

"The policy and attitude of the United States Government toward every important phase of international relationships in this hemisphere could scarcely be made more clear and definite than they have been made by both word and action especially since March 4. I have no disposition therefore to indulge in any repetition or rehearsal of these acts and utterances and shall not do so. Every observing person must by this time thoroughly understand that under the Roosevelt Administration the United States Government is as much opposed as any other government to interference with the freedom, the sovereignty, or other internal affairs or processes of the governments of other nations.

"In addition to numerous acts and utterances in connection with the carrying out of these doctrines and policies, President Roosevelt, during recent weeks, gave out a public statement expressing his disposition to open negotiations with the Cuban Government for the purpose of dealing with the treaty which has existed since 1903. I feel safe in undertaking to say that under our support of the general principle of non-intervention as has been suggested, no government need fear any intervention on the part of the United States under the Roosevelt Administration. I think it unfortunate that during the brief period of this Conference there is apparently not time within which to prepare interpretations and definitions of these fundamental terms that are embraced in the report. Such definitions and interpretations would enable every government to proceed in a uniform way without any difference of opinion or of interpretations. I hope that at the earliest possible date such very important work will be done. In the meantime in case of differences of interpretations and also until they (the proposed doctrines and principles) can be worked out and codified for the common use of every government, I desire to say that the United States Government in all of its international associations and relationships and conduct will follow scrupulously the doctrines and policies which it has pursued since March 4 which are embodied in the different addresses of President Roosevelt since that time and in the recent peace address of myself on the 15th day of December before this Conference and in the law of nations as generally recognized and accepted."

The delegates of Brazil and Peru recorded the following private vote with regard to article 11: "That they accept the doctrine in principle but that they do not consider it codifiable because there are some countries which have not yet signed the Anti-War Pact of Rio de Janeiro of which this doctrine is a part and therefore it does not yet constitute positive international law suitable for codification."