treated as state property."91

It is important to note that in addition to Cold War pressures, there were other, older influences brought to bear on the 1959 declaration. Some recalled the conflicts between Catholics and Protestants which occupied a prominent place in the work of the League of Nations' Child Welfare Committee. Catholic associations and countries were already uneasy with any discussion of rights since Pope Pius XII proclaimed in 1948 that mankind should not presume to pronounce on something that existed above and beyond himself. Catholic representatives insisted on distinguishing legitimate children from illegitimate ones, arguing that equality for the latter "would... undermine the family structures which were the very bedrock of the rights of the child." They were also concerned by the rights of children before birth. Catholic insistence on the rights of unborn children was counterbalanced by fears of overpopulation in the developing world.

There were divisions between rich and poor which reflected the fear among developing nations that they might be burdened with expensive commitments to their children that they would not be able to meet. India, for instance, opposed a Moscow-sponsored clause calling on the state (and other institutions) to assist parents in raising large families. The Laotian delegate remarked perceptively that these types of commitments were "within the capacity only of some Western and Anglo-Saxon countries." Ghana's representative to the UN General Assembly added: "It would be interesting to see to what extent the colonial powers found it possible to implement the principle [of free and compulsory education] in their dependent territories." In order to respond to these concerns, the preamble of the 1959 Declaration urged states to "recognize these rights and strive for their observance progressively."

Conclusion: Children's Rights and Peace

Commenting on the power the UN Charter allocated to the Security Council over the economic and social agencies, and over human rights and fundamental freedoms, a former League of Nations official argued against separating the UN's "technical work" from its collective security functions. He believed that "the best hope for reducing the military preoccupation of the Council... is to increase the volume of constructive co-operation for which the whole Organization will be responsible." Canadian diplomats also claimed that "security and economic well-being are two sides of the same coin" and "a valid basis for world peace can only be found in an