# Why has the United States of America Not Ratified the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child? The Veto Fulcrum as a New Health Policy Analysis Framework

**Author: Lia Harris, MD, Clinical Assistant Professor of Pediatrics, University of British Columbia School of Medicine**

## Abstract

**Background**: The United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC) enshrines health as a human right among other rights for children, the fulfillment of which can be advanced by each member state legally endorsing the principles through ratification of the Convention. The most rapidly and widely ratified human rights treaty in history, only the United States of America of all of the UN state parties has not ratified the CRC. This study aimed to determine the reason(s) the CRC has not been ratified by the USA.

**Methodology:** Method design involved a mapping literature search and in-depth interviews with key stakeholders in the fields of global health, child rights, health policy, and US law.

**Results:** Implementing the health policy triangle to systematize themes into content, context, processes, and actors as opposition or proponents of ratification, finds the literature favors ratification of the CRC. Notably, the published literature focuses on pros and cons of ratification of the CRC, rather than reasons why the US has not ratified. Interview informants further expanded themes to elucidate how the history of opposition actors and processes has led to a chilling effect and a status quo of non-ratification, which has become increasingly challenging to overcome. Drawing on the veto player theory to explain the status quo and introducing a new policy analysis framework of a veto fulcrum reveals that within the process of ratification, single powerful actors at a veto fulcrum have made undemocratic decisions, obstructing CRC ratification.

**Conclusions:** By investigating American non-ratification of the CRC this research has forged a new policy framework, the veto fulcrum, which examines political systems

where political actors – who might even be democratically elected – as veto players have extraordinary power to make executive decisions against public opinion, and against good health policy.

**What is already known on this topic**

- Published literature focuses on reasons for or against US ratification of the CRC, rather than reasons why America has not ratified.

**What this study adds**

- Application of the health policy triangle and veto player theory to answer why the US has not ratified the CRC.
- A new policy analysis framework approach – the veto fulcrum – to understand the correlation between actors and processes in the non-ratification of policy.
- Using a veto fulcrum framework highlights the ascendancy of single actors in policy decisions by examining how, by whom, and why these single actors make decisions and/or might be influenced.
- An outline on how the veto fulcrum framework can be applied to understand other policy decisions.

**How this study might affect research, practice, or policy**

- Using the policy framework of a veto fulcrum can identify and examine barriers to ratification or enactment of a health or other good governance policy.

## Introduction

The 1989 United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC or the Convention) was envisioned to assure the full rights and freedoms to which every person is entitled under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, but with specific focus on children, because “the child, by reason of his physical and mental immaturity, needs special safeguards and care”. (1) Human rights were enshrined at an international level in 1948 with the adoption of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR) by the state parties to the United Nations at the time and have subsequently become part of legally binding international law, by means of two Covenants. (2) By outlining a set of fundamental human values, the ratifying state parties to the Covenants agree to legal protection of individual persons through their internationally agreed rights. The UN member states later acknowledged the extra needs of children by drafting the CRC, beginning in 1979, the UN Year of the Child, adopting it in 1989. (1) The CRC, meant to respect, protect, and fulfill the rights of children, has been the most rapidly and widely ratified human rights treaty in history.

Health is a central covenant in the CRC; borrowing the language from the Constitution of the World Health Organization (WHO), Article 24 of the CRC recognizes the rights of children to “the enjoyment of the highest attainable standard of health”. (1,3) Harnessing the universal recognition of child health as a human right within a global policy instrument should enshrine children’s entitlement to basic health care in not only wealthy countries, but critically for “children living in exceptionally difficult conditions, and that such children need special consideration”. (1) Therefore, even though the CRC

is not specifically a health policy initiative, the universal consensus on the importance of child rights, including the acknowledgement of health as a human right for children, should be considered a first step in ensuring legal protection of health rights for children worldwide.

Ratification of the CRC signifies the endorsement of a member state on the importance of health and other rights for children within the state, and children of the world. Arguably, ratification does not guarantee respect for child rights by member states; indeed, violations of children's rights continue to occur around the world, not the least of which is lack of health care. (4) However, ratification requires member states to submit reports to the Committee on the Rights of the Child two years after ratification then every five years thereafter, allowing the Committee to review and comment on states' standing on child rights protection, and more importantly, giving civil society organizations opportunity to report violations. (5,6) Through these mechanisms, the CRC has been instrumentalized to help improve the health and wellbeing of children in ratifying member states. For example, many countries have used the CRC as a basis for enhancing existing legislation, or have appointed special ombudspersons or envoys for children. (6) The CRC has been referenced in various member states to improve the uptake of birth registrations, increase access to free elementary school, reduce child marriage, and change traditional views on female circumcision. (5) Ratification of the CRC was found to reduce child mortality in excess of natural trends following ratification by a member state. (7)

## The USA and the CRC

Only one UN member state has not ratified - agreed to be legally bound by – the CRC. The USA became the outlier of 196 eligible UN member states in 2015 when Somalia and South Sudan were the last two states to accede to the original convention. (1) The US State Department webpage claims to put human rights at the center of foreign policy, yet it remains the exception on ratifying a human rights treaty which is meant to protect “the most voiceless, voteless, and vulnerable human beings on earth”. (8–10) It is essential, therefore, to investigate underlying factors which may be contributing to the non-ratification.

The United States was extensively involved in the drafting of the CRC. Drawn, in part, from the US Constitution, the United States made recommendations for 38 of the CRC’s articles and did ratify the two optional protocols. (8) The US became a state signatory to the CRC on February 16, 1995, but has not subsequently ratified it, which requires the sitting American President to submit the treaty to the US Senate, who must approve it with a two-thirds vote. (11) Table 1 summarizes the process of international treaty ratification in the US. (6)

**Summary of Steps in the U.S. Process of Making Multilateral Treaties**

The making of multilateral treaties for the United States involves a series of steps that generally include 1) negotiation and conclusion; 2) signing by the President; 3) transmittal to the Senate by the President, which may include any proposed reservations, declarations, and understandings; 4) referral to the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations; 5) Committee consideration and report to the Senate recommending approval and a proposed resolution of ratification, which may include reservations, declarations, or understandings; 6) Senate approval of advice and consent to ratification by a two-thirds majority; 7) ratification by the President; 8) deposit of instrument of ratification; and 9) proclamation. While the House of Representatives does not participate in the treaty-making process, legislation implementing any treaties requires action by both houses of Congress.

**Table 1: Summary of Steps in the US Process of making Multilateral Treaties from Blanchfield, L. Congressional Research Service.** (6)

The CRC remains with the current President, to be put forth to the Senate for approval (step 3 in Table 1). The last president to address the issue was then-Senator, Barack Obama, who said it was “embarrassing” the USA had not ratified it, and had promised to “review this and other treaties to ensure the United States resumes its global leadership in human rights”, yet as President he did not submit it to the Senate. (12) Most recently, on February 12, 2020, Representative Ilhan Omar submitted Resolution 854 to the 116$^{th}$ Congress, recommending the US ratify the CRC, which was forwarded to the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, but there has been no further activity. (13)

The non-ratification status of the CRC is counter to the American public's support of ratification, and the domestic policies it would endorse. A study conducted on the 20th anniversary of the adoption of the CRC found that in a survey using random digit dialing of registered American voters, respondents favored ratification by a four to one margin (62-14%), and that opposition to ratification was low. (14) More recently, in two separate polls Americans indicate too little is spent on children, and they support policies which would assist families with children, including policies involving tax credits, childcare, paid leave, adoption, health care, and housing. (15,16) Further, three quarters of Americans view health as a human right. (17)

## Methods

### Study Design

The research question was approached using two methods, involving a mapping literature search and in-depth interviews with key stakeholders in CRC policy. Patient involvement was not included. Public involvement was included as key informants representative of child rights.

### Policy Frameworks

Analysis and synthesis of the qualitative data was guided by a conceptual framework developed by Walt and Gilson. From the field of health policy analysis, Walt and Gilson found analysis of health policies tended to place excess focus on the content of a policy,

ignoring the context, processes, and actors related to policy action, and developed the health policy triangle as a model to understand the factors and their relationships in policy implementation. (18) Figure 1 demonstrates the relationship of the content, context, process, and actors of policy enactment.

**Figure 1: Health Policy Triangle from Walt and Gilson** (18)




A complementary policy analysis framework, Tsebelis' veto player theory, derives from political science, describing the inherent bias toward the status quo in policy making by identifying the key points in a political system at which policy initiatives can potentially be blocked. (19) A veto player is a political actor who can stop a change from the status quo. (ibid) Where there are a greater number of veto players, there is a greater chance of veto, and a tendency to the status quo. In this way, veto player theory highlights the dependent interaction between actors and processes of treaty ratification. This paper explores the role of veto players on the process of CRC ratification.

### Stage 1: Literature Review

A systematic approach mapping review of the literature was conducted on four databases: Medline, Scopus, Web of Science, and Google Scholar for both published and grey literature since 1989 (chosen as the year of UN adoption) using the SPIDER search strategy tool. (20-22) The search terms and associated synonyms in combination with MeSH subject headings, where available, formed the search strategy for the literature review. Keyword searches included ‘United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child’ or ‘CRC’ or ‘child rights’ and ‘United States of America’ or ‘USA’ and ‘ratify’ or ‘ratification’ or ‘agree’ or ‘agreement’ using Boolean operators. Non-systematic grey literature searches such as reference mining, citation searches, website searches, and searches of congressional records using the same search terms on the congress.gov website were included. (21,22) Grey literature such as press releases, news stories, editorials or blog posts were included, but evaluated as lower quality material. Articles were included in the study if they were published after 1989, English language, and related to USA ratification of the CRC. Publications which addressed US ratification of all of the UN human rights treaties, if they also included CRC, were included. Papers were included if they referenced CRC ratification by the USA, even if it was not the primary focus of the paper. The PRISMA flow diagram for databases, registers, and other sources was used to sort publications (Supplement 1). (23) Articles obtained from the search were initially assessed for suitability from just their titles and abstracts, then those found to be suitable were subjected to a review of the whole text. Publications which did not have abstracts were scanned, and the conclusion was read to determine suitability.

### Stage 2: In-Depth Interviews

The second part of the research was conducting in-depth interviews with key informants who are stakeholders with respect to child health, child rights, and US policy law, who have professional knowledge of, or whose work might relate to the CRC. Questions were semi-structured, loosely following the Interview Outline Questions informed by the literature search (Supplement 2). Some interview questions were standardized to ensure data source triangulation, to aim to ensure validity and reliability on data collected from different informants; however, the topic guide for the interviews was designed to be open-ended to maintain a sufficiently broad focus, to allow for hidden or emerging themes. As well, questions specific to each informant's area of expertise were included. On reflection of the bias inherent in interviewing only pro-ratification informants, invitations were extended to interview actors who have been involved in opposing ratification. Selection of key informants was based on purposive sampling, by identification of individuals from literature searches, and snowball sampling/chain referral. (24) They were approached to participate through telephone, email, or social media, specifically Twitter and LinkedIn, depending on contact information available, using a standardized message. A starting number of 8-10 were chosen as possible informants for the in-depth interviews, but the final number of 14 informants was determined through achieving thematic saturation. (25) Inclusion criteria for possible informants were key stakeholders with knowledge of US law and/or treaty policy, child health policy, global child health, or child rights. Much of the value of the research was felt to be the expertise of the experts in the field, so informants were specifically asked

to consent to being identified. The purposive and chain referral/snowball methods were limited by the primary researcher's access to informants, the most obvious omission being lack of access to key actors in CRC ratification – the US President and Senators. Other limitations of interviews might have included informants' hesitation to give sensitive political opinions, and concern about whether the research aligns with their own priorities. Also, elite informants may have little time, and thus present standard responses in the interest of time. (26)

**Data Analysis**

1. In Stage 1, a thematic content analysis of the literature was conducted, based on identifying themes relevant to the research question, in particular, opposition themes related to content, context, processes and actors. Data were extracted from the literature search and evaluated using a grounded theory approach both manually in Word and pdf documents with line-by-line open coding supported by NVivo to distil the broad patterns and consolidate them into themes. (27,28) Identified themes were classified into barriers/opposition and enablers/proponents of ratification, and sub-classified by content, context, process, and actors.
2. In Stage 2, thematic content analysis of the interview transcripts was conducted. Each interview was analyzed immediately following, with preliminary analysis informing further data collection in an iterative approach. Supporting the iterative approach, each informant was asked to suggest other potential informants.

Themes derived from the interviews were compared with themes from the literature for external validity and representativeness.

# Results

### Stage 1: Literature Review

The literature review yielded 68 publications after PRISMA assessment for relevance (Supplement 1). Most of the publications were not peer reviewed or systematic reviews. Rather, they were expert opinion or editorials in the fields of political science, US law, human rights, or public health policy, which could not be evaluated using the standard Critical Appraisal Skills Program (CASP) checklists but were evaluated using a modified version of the qualitative study CASP checklist (Supplement 3). (29)

Four publications opined that the CRC should not be ratified (two from opposing actors, two indicating it would make no difference to child welfare), and eight others were neutral on the topic, three of which were congressional reports intended to be neutral and the other five indicating ratification would not make a difference to the wellbeing of children. Otherwise, 56 (82%) papers favored ratification. Nearly half (28/68, 41%) of the articles were from the discipline of US law, 12 each from medicine/public health and rights advocates, eight from political science, three from the field of psychology, and one each from the fields of anthropology, social work, religious studies, ethics, and education. Supplement 4 lists the publications and CASP evaluation.

### Generation of Themes from the Literature

Each publication was combed for themes which represented opposition to ratification using open coding. (30) Although the majority of articles were pro-ratification, many documents identified opposition arguments so they could be refuted, thus revealing opposition themes. During the thematic analysis it became clear most of the publications included multiple themes on reasons why the US should ratify the CRC. Therefore, two general categories, themes supporting ratification, and themes opposing ratification were created. Each category was subclassified into content, context, process, and actors, based on Walt and Gilson's health policy triangle. The themes were thus organized into these eight subclasses, as shown in Table 2.

**Table 2: Opposition and Pro-Ratification Factors of the CRC in the Health Policy Triangle**

| | **Opposition to ratification** | **Pro-ratification** |
|---|---|---|
| Actors | • Republican Presidents and Senators<br>• Conservative Christian organization lobbyists<br>• Home schooling advocates | • Democrat Presidents and Senators<br>• International community<br>• Global child health actors<br>• Over 200 NGOs (31)<br>• Child health and welfare advocates<br>• American people (14)<br>• Children and youth |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Processes | • US treaty-ratifying system<br>• In the queue behind other treaties | • Advocacy<br>• Lobbying US government |
| Context | • Historical opposition to treaties<br>• Parent rights<br>• Opposition to child rights<br>• Children cannot vote | • Increasing infringement of child rights<br>• Retrogression of child health and wellbeing outcomes in America (32)<br>• Increasing inequity |
| Content | • Lacks clarity on certain content (abortion)<br>• Different than Constitution laws<br>• Not beneficial or justifiable | • Best interest of the child<br>• Provision, protection, and participation rights<br>• Non-discrimination |

The ‘Pro-ratification’ themes in the second column will not be discussed further here, because pro-ratification themes do not answer the research question why the CRC has not been ratified. Multiple publications from academics, professional groups, and civil society organizations include pro-ratification themes. (33–39)

## Opposition Themes

Themes arising during the literature analysis became recurrent during the open coding, regardless of the discipline or background of the source. Initially, each opposition argument was coded as a separate theme, but with continued reading and coding it became clear several opposition themes were not only repeated in the CRC literature but have been opposition arguments against international human rights treaties in America for decades. In fact, many were found to be detailed in a typology of objections to ratification in Natalie Kaufman's book, *Human Rights Treaties and the Senate: A History of Opposition*, which was referenced by multiple publications included in this study. (40) Therefore, these arguments from the opposition were collected into a super-theme titled "Historical Opposition to International Treaties" for several reasons. First, they are almost exclusively context-related opposition. Second, enmity towards international human rights treaties within the US has existed since the 1950s, beginning with American opposition to the Genocide Convention, and for which generations of political and legal scholars have provided valid counterarguments that need not be repeated here. (37,40–44) Finally, focussing on these arguments does not advance scholarship on explaining reasons why the CRC has not been ratified. The 'Historical Opposition to International Treaties' themes are listed in order of theme frequency in Table 3, with definitions.

**Table 3: Historical Opposition to International Treaties**

| Theme Name | Theme Definition | #Publications noting the theme |
|---|---|---|
| Legal | The concern that US laws would need to be rewritten to comply with the CRC (similarly with other international treaties) | 43 |
| Sovereignty | The concern that ratifying an international treaty gives power to an international organization, the UN, to dictate laws which would govern people within America | 37 |
| Federalism | The concern that if the President and Congress ratify a treaty which informs laws primarily under individual state governance (such as health, education, adoption, and juvenile justice) it would give power to the national government over the state governments | 33 |
| American Exceptionalism | The belief that "the US is distinctive, unique or exemplary compared to other nations", and does not need to ratify UN treaties. (45) | 30 |
| Constitution laws are | A subset theme of American Exceptionalism, and opposite to the Legal theme, is the belief | 25 |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| adequate or better | that US Constitutional laws are adequate or better than CRC | |
| US distrust of the UN | A waxing and waning political norm in America since the 1950s | 6 |
| In the queue | The idea that the CRC will be ratified after the US ratifies earlier UN treaties, such as the Convention on the Elimination of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW) | 6 |
| Opposition to Rights for All | "opponents sought to block human rights treaties, not because they posed a threat to constitutional rights, but because of the equality they guaranteed" (46) | 4 |

**Opposition Themes Specific to CRC**

Most of the remainder of the opposition themes are content- and context-specific arguments put forth by opposition actors against the CRC specifically, included in Table 2 and defined in Table 4. Again, they will not be discussed, because they are primarily arguments against, not reasons why the non-ratification of the CRC, and Convention scholars have already refuted them elsewhere. (41,47–50)

**Table 4: Opposition Themes Specific to CRC**

| Theme Name | Theme Definition | #Publications noting the theme |
|---|---|---|
| Parents' rights | The concern that affirming rights for children, particularly freedoms, would take away parents' rights to raise their children with their own education, values, religion, and beliefs, or that parents could be taken to court if they infringed their child's rights | 40 |
| Not Beneficial or Justifiable | The observation that ratifying countries continue to violate child rights and/or the belief that US ratification would be of no benefit to American children | 24 |
| Against Child Rights | The ideology that children should not have rights, or should not have rights equal to adults | 17 |
| Content Clarity | Exclusive to the topic of abortion, opposition actors have argued the CRC can be viewed as supportive of abortion. On the contrary, the drafters carefully did not include text for or against abortion - due to its controversy – to increase uptake of ratification. (41) | 14 |
| Opposition | Individuals or groups who have opposed CRC | 35 |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Actors | ratification | |
| Processes hindering ratification | The process of requiring a supportive President, then support from the Senate with a 2/3 majority, a supermajority | 29 |

**Opposition Actors and Processes**

The themes of opposition actors and processes are combined here because the two are characteristically intertwined regarding CRC ratification. The most critical finding within the literature is that the treaty ratification process in the US depends heavily on the action of individuals. For example, President George Bush Sr. did not sign the Convention when it was first adopted by the UN, despite it having already received the approval of the Senate and the House, both of which had passed Resolutions with large majorities sponsored by both sides urging Bush to sign it and submit it to seek the advice and consent of the Senate to its ratification. (51–54) Later, the Chair of the Foreign Relations Committee, Republican Senator Jesse Helms, opposed the CRC when it was signed by the Clinton administration, indicating, "as long as I am chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, it is going to be very difficult for this treaty even to be given a hearing". (41,55) Farther back, treaty scholars argue that it was Republican Senator Bricker's proposed Bricker Amendment to the Constitution, and the resistance to the Genocide Convention backed by conservative lobby in the 1950s which has been instrumental in setting a precedent, creating the American legacy of non-ratification of human rights treaties. (42,56) Most recently, the Obama administration expressed support for the CRC, but faced a Senate Resolution put forth

by Republican Senator Jim DeMint, with 37 Republican Senator co-sponsors – more than the number needed to veto – resolving that "the President should not transmit the Convention to the Senate for its advice and consent". (57) In fact, the civil society lobbyists opposed to the CRC can be traced to eight conservative Christian groups and distilled further to a handful of conservative Christian leaders, who worked to influence decisions in the Senate on this and other human rights treaties (Opposition Actors in Table 2). (47,58–60) The process of ratification of the CRC highlights how an extraordinarily small number of actors can influence major policy decisions.

**Stage 2: Interviews**

Invitations for interview were extended to experts working in the fields of global health, human rights, child rights, US law, and political lobbyists. On reflection of the inherent bias of interviewing only pro-ratification informants, invitations were also extended to the eight lobby organizations who were known to oppose the CRC at the time of the original adoption. Professor Lynne Marie Kohm was the only opposition informant who kindly agreed to be interviewed. Supplement 5 summarizes the potential informants to whom an invitation for interview was extended.

Ultimately, 14 informants were interviewed between July 19 and September 6, 2023. The interviews were evaluated using the COREQ consolidated criteria for reporting qualitative research 32-item checklist for interviews and focus groups (Supplement 6). (61) Table 5 lists in alphabetical order the informants, their job title, organization, and area of expertise.

**Table 5: Informant Details**

| | Informant | Job Title, Organization | Expertise |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Smita Baruah | - Leader in global child health advocacy<br>- Former Head of Government Relations for Save the Children U.S. | Child rights advocacy |
| 2 | Jo Becker | - Advocacy Director, Children's Rights Division at Human Rights Watch<br>- Author, *Campaigning for Children* | Child rights advocacy |
| 3 | Adam Benforado | - Professor of Law, Thomas R. Kline School of Law, Drexel University<br>- Author, *A Minor Revolution* | Child rights law |
| 4 | Daisy Francis | - Former Senior Researcher and Policy Analyst, then Advocacy Strategy and Technical Advisor, World Vision USA<br>- Former Protection Policy Advisor, Catholic Relief Services | Child rights advocacy |
| 5 | Dr. John Kahler | - Pediatrician<br>- Co-Founder, MedGlobal, INGO | Global child health |
| 6 | Lynne Marie Kohm | Professor and John Brown McCarty Professor of Family Law, Regent University School of Law | Family law |
| 7 | Nate Lance | Senior Policy Advisor, World Vision USA | Child rights advocacy |
| 8 | Bruce | President, First Focus on Children | Child rights |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Lesley | (Interviewed together with Leila Nimatallah) | advocacy |
| 9 | Dr. Joanne Liu | - Professor, McGill School of Population and Global Health<br>- Adjunct Clinical Professor, University Of Montreal, in Pediatric Emergency Medicine<br>- Former International President, Médecins Sans Frontières | Global child health |
| 10 | Emily Mendenhall | Medical Anthropologist and Professor, Georgetown University School of Foreign Service | Health rights |
| 11 | Leila Nimatallah | Vice President for Mobilization and Advocacy, First Focus on Children (Interviewed with Bruce Lesley) | Child rights advocacy |
| 12 | Mandy Slutsker | Director, Global Child Health Advocacy, American Academy of Pediatrics | Global child health advocacy |
| 13 | Jonathan Todres | - Distinguished University Professor and Professor of Law, Georgia State University College of Law<br>- Editor, *The Oxford Handbook of Children's Rights Law* | Child rights law |
| 14 | Dr. Paul Wise | - Richard E. Behrman Professor of Child Health and Society<br>- Professor of Pediatrics, Stanford University School of Medicine<br>- Juvenile Care Monitor for the Federal Court for | Child health policy |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | the Treatment of Migrant Children in US Detention | |

**Generation of Themes from Interviews**

Informants provided paradoxical data. On the one hand, there were no opposition arguments for which they did not have an easy counterargument. For example, on the question of sovereignty, Jonathan Todres observed, “the US ratified the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and sovereignty didn't crumble, so it's possible”, and Jo Becker highlights that the US did ratify the two optional protocols, so already the US must report to the UN Committee on the Rights of the Child. Regarding the Legal theme, Dr. Paul Wise notes, “lawyers, our laws, are critical for a lot of things, but how we raise our families, how communities help families are based on norms and the way I think about it is these norms are not, cannot be mandated, they must be felt”. Nate Lance commented that to accept American exceptionalism as an argument for not ratifying the CRC, “I think would logically have to accept, then, that there's no further improvements the US can make, and I would disagree with that”. Bruce Lesley reprehends the opposition’s prioritization of banning books; meanwhile American children are increasingly dying from gun violence. Daisy Francis and Dr. John Kahler both observe the insincerity of the “family values” and the parents’ rights arguments, because the opposition actors who promote these arguments do not champion refugee families at the border, or parents who support their LGBTQ+ children. In response to the idea that children should not have rights, Adam Benforado emphasizes “those are the arguments that have been used to deprive women of rights, that were used in the

United States to deprive Black people of rights, that have given second class citizenship to Chinese American rail workers… those are the arguments that are the history of oppression in the United States", and that, "the key here is it is not a zero-sum game; when you give children rights, it does not detract from other people's rights". Similarly, Emily Mendenhall observes, "children are human, and humans all have a right to basic needs and safety and security and food and healthcare." Smita Baruah reflects that the American public endorses the CRC; "[t]here's been a lot of polling done amongst Republican and Democratic voters, so I think it is absolutely, in my opinion, it does represent the American values."

On the other side of the paradox, the informants have lost all expectation of ratification, made clear in the language they use on the likelihood of ratification; "there is not the political will", "dead in the water", "unlikely that it is going to fly", "political suicide", "harder and harder", "killing it permanently", "such a monumental lift", "politically catastrophic", "that's magical thinking", "the Convention would take a lot of political capital to move", "I'm very skeptical", "I do not think the gerontocracy right now cares", and "the atomic bomb of topics that no one's going to touch". As can be seen, there is a contradiction of pro-ratification informants providing easy counterarguments to opposition, while remaining doubtful on the possibility of ratification. Of the pro-ratification informants, only Adam Benforado remains optimistic that the CRC will be ratified.

Importantly, data from all the informants confirmed the validity of the data from the literature on historical opposition themes. However, new themes were revealed during

the interviews, which were not apparent in the literature. They are summarized as Chilling Effects, Children Cannot Vote, and Future Policy Directions. The new themes are listed and defined in Table 6. The theme Future Policy Directions will not be discussed further, because this theme outlines ideas on advocacy towards ratification, rather than answering the question why the CRC has not been ratified.

**Table 6: New Themes from Interviews**

| | **Theme Name** | **Theme Definition** | **#Informants noting the theme** |
|---|---|---|---|
| Chilling Effects (Effects of child rights advocates abandoning lobby efforts to have the CRC ratified) | Off the Agenda | Ratification is not a current issue in Congress; politicians are not interested | 12 |
| | Too Difficult to Ratify | Resignation to the idea that due to historical opposition and the US international policy norm of not ratifying international human rights treaties, the US will likely never ratify the CRC | 11 |
| | Other Efforts | Would-be CRC supporters have turned to other efforts to improve the rights and lives of children | 9 |
| | Silent Supporters | Actors who support child rights and/or ratification of the CRC, who are not actively seeking to have it ratified | 8 |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Children Cannot Vote | Unlike other human rights' movements, the beneficiaries of the CRC do not have electoral agency | 6 |
| Future Policy Directions | Ideas for future advocacy and policy action | 13 |

**Chilling Effects**

All of the pro-ratification informants endorse the ideals of the CRC and believe it should be ratified in principle, however, most perceive it would require insurmountable effort to have it ratified. The pro-ratification informants view getting the CRC passed by the US Congress as a virtual impossibility, observing that the CRC is off the agenda, too much work to ratify, and/or that other endeavours would be more fruitful in affirming the rights and improving the lives of children (see Table 6).

Consequently, they have elected to use their energy elsewhere in promoting the rights of children. Mandy Slutsker, for example, says "I think what matters most is whether or not children's rights are being upheld and not whether or not a piece of paper has been signed." The efforts which might have gone into advocating for ratification of the CRC are instead being channelled into other child advocacy projects. For example, Bruce Lesley and Leila Nimatallah from First Focus on Children are lobbying for an Independent Children's Commissioner, advancing a 'best interest of the child' standard, and engaging Republicans and the conservative faith communities. Jo Becker and

Human Rights Watch continue to report on child labor, juvenile justice, and child marriage in America. (62) Pediatricians are working on gun violence prevention. Nate Lance and World Vision are working with USAID and the State Department on policies affecting children, implementing the foreign assistance for USAID with the State Department as their partners, and building relationships with members of Congress who are responsible for writing and passing bills. Informants provided an extensive list of other efforts and successes in their child rights advocacy; time and effort which is not being put towards advocating for CRC ratification.

**Children Cannot Vote**

It was the direct or indirect observation of all of the pro-ratification informants that politicians work to remain in office; therefore, they do not prioritize children's issues because children cannot cast ballots. Dr. Joanne Liu noted this theme most succinctly, observing, "Children are the constituents of nobody; they don't vote, the same thing as migrants." While it is important to acknowledge that other groups like women, and Black, Indigenous and people of colour have not yet realized full equality in America, children do not even have the voice afforded to them. Jo Becker observed that the Parkland students protesting for gun reforms could only threaten that one day they would have a vote.

# Discussion

## Health Policy Triangle

Reviewing the non-ratification of the CRC using the framework of the health policy triangle, it is evident that pro-ratification *actors* within America far outweigh opposing actors, and the *context* and *content* of the CRC also favour ratification – the literature weighs heavily on pro-ratification themes, including offering feasible solutions to opposition arguments - ultimately, it is the *process* which has prohibited ratification. As outlined in Table 1, a veto from the Senate requires not a majority, but opposition votes of only one-third plus one senators for it to fail, or even by leaving it off the agenda. Indeed, according to the US Senate website, “In some cases, when Senate leadership believed a treaty lacked sufficient support for approval, the Senate simply did not vote on the treaty and it was eventually withdrawn by the president”. (11) Importantly, compared to other countries, the American system of “a two-thirds majority is a more stringent requirement than that of any other nation for ratifying treaties”, making ratification extremely challenging, as the informants observed. (47) The USA has ratified only three of nine of the core UN conventions, and only five of eighteen treaties if optional protocols are included; America has set a precedent of not ratifying multiple prior human rights treaties. (63) Thus, the process of CRC non-ratification by the United States began far earlier than the drafting of the CRC.

## Veto Player Theory

Further, this research has found that process is not the only factor preventing ratification of the CRC; as noted, actors are intimately tied to process, and certain actors - veto players - have been influential in the non-ratification. Veto player theory in Tsebelis' original work describes how the greater number of veto players in a political system increases the chance of veto of a particular policy, and a tendency to the status quo. (19) Tsebelis identifies that the US has many veto players, the President, the House, and the Senate, which impedes change from the status quo as a result of the large number of actors who must agree to any proposed change. (ibid) While the ratification of the CRC and other international human rights treaties depend on only two of those veto players, the President and the Senate (Table 1), this research has found that the CRC has been chronically vetoed, and the longer it is vetoed, the more likely ratification is chilled, and the status quo remains.

## A New Policy Analysis Framework

This research therefore proposes that veto players are the fulcrum of a balance. By adapting the health policy triangle with the veto actors at the centre of the triangle, content/context as the weights, and process/lobby actors as the moveability of the fulcrum, it becomes evident that ratification of a treaty in the American system depends primarily on individual decisions of actors in the veto positions. Put simply, the relative weights of arguments for or against ratification are not of prime relevance, but rather, ratification/change depends on the action of the player in the veto position, and the motility of the fulcrum, the process. Figure 2 illustrates the ratification of a policy for

which context and content favor ratification, and how veto players and process can impede ratification.

**Figure 2: How Veto Players and Process Obstruct Ratification**




While it would be impossible to conjecture whether the CRC might have been ratified with different veto players in power, the history of non-ratification of the CRC highlights how the decision of a single individual can veto a policy. For example, in the case of the CRC in the American system, consider the outcome if a ratification-friendly president had been in power at the time of its adoption instead of George Bush Sr., when it had already received majority approval from both the Senate and the House. (51–54) Likewise, if the Chair of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee at the time it was signed by the Clinton administration had been more open to ratification than Republican Senator Jesse Helms, the Convention might have been transmitted to the Senate, passing at least one veto point. If, during Obama's time as President, the Senate had

been pro-ratification, then both President and Senate would have viewed it favorably. Early in America's history with human rights treaties, if Republican Senator Bricker had not resisted the Genocide Convention, it is plausible that all of the human rights treaties before the CRC would have been accepted as American political norms, and the CRC would have been ratified simply as one of many. (42,56)

Thus, treaty ratification is determined by the decision of the veto player(s) at the fulcrum, not by the relative weights of opposition and support, and a tipping point could theoretically occur by changing the mind of a veto player or changing the veto player. In the process of CRC ratification, it should be possible to move the position of the fulcrum by convincing the veto player(s) at the fulcrum on the value of ratification. In other words, if the current President and Senate understood the American public is pro-ratification, these players in veto positions should want to satisfy their constituents, moving the green arrow in Figure 3. (14) On the other hand, the influence of powerful opposition lobby organizations, who are often private special interest actors, can move the fulcrum away from good health policy (red arrow Fig. 3). In the case of prolonged veto, the process is affected because would-be advocates abandon hope of ratification, which cements the fulcrum in place, eliminating the green arrow in Figure 3.

**Figure 3: Moving the Veto Fulcrum**




The research exercise of identifying and categorizing themes of opposition led to the discovery that most of the opposition themes in the literature were *arguments against* ratification, rather than *reasons why* the US has not ratified the CRC. What seems like an insignificant distinction, led to the creation of the veto fulcrum framework to answer the research question. Most of the arguments against the CRC have been general arguments against the US ratifying human rights treaties for decades yet have been easily refuted by proponents of ratification. However, the pattern of non-ratification became one of the *reasons why* the CRC is not ratified; non-ratification of human rights treaties has become the status quo in America, because veto players at key moments in history have chilled prospects for ratification, causing child rights proponents to abandon hope and turn their energy elsewhere.

## Veto Fulcrum Framework

Understanding the political power which actors can exert on and from the veto fulcrum is a framework which can be employed to understand other global and national political systems which tip the balance away from health-friendly policies. Critically analyzing the veto fulcrum can advance understanding on why a policy has not passed. Actors at a veto fulcrum make big decisions, often against the will of the population, in otherwise democratic systems. Examining the non-ratification of the CRC also highlights the political power of lobby organizations (red arrow, Figure 3), many of whom are single-interest groups, political action committees (PACs), industry, individual wealthy donors, or private corporations. The CRC has not been ratified because initially powerful opposition lobbyists influenced the actors at the veto fulcrum, and the fulcrum has subsequently become immovable, giving one actor absolute power in a system which has been the antithesis of the democratic process. Case in point: at this moment, a single actor - the President of the US - is exerting political power by leaving the CRC off the agenda, effectively vetoing it (see Step 3, Table 1).

Examining the US non-ratification of the CRC exemplifies how the veto fulcrum framework can identify the obstruction to health and other good governance policy change; for example, each of the following policy arenas should be evaluated using the veto fulcrum framework (each could be its own focus of research, which is beyond the scope of this paper). Indeed, this research is not the first to find the United States is not governed democratically. (64) For one, the Supreme Court of the United States is an unelected veto player which has recently shifted the veto fulcrum on several policy

issues, including abortion, affirmative action in universities, student debt repayment, and LGBTQ+ rights, away from good health policy, away from prior legislation, and against the wishes of the people. (65-68) The same conservative lobbyists who opposed the CRC (Table 2, and red arrow in Figure 3) have also backed the appointment of the new Supreme Court Justices, and wrote the Republican presidential campaign Project 2025. (47,58–60,67,68). In another example of an undemocratic veto fulcrum in international governance, the five permanent members of the UN Security Council (UNSC - China, France, Russia, the United Kingdom, and the United States) each holds a veto vote on all Council decisions which cements the veto fulcrum of the UNSC, creating a stalemate on decisions which affect the security of the world's people. It is urgent to examine who influences the UNSC veto players, because at the time of this writing six of the last ten vetoes of the UNSC have been on the "the situation in the Middle East". (69) In an illustration of private actors as veto players, governance of media and social media can be analyzed as veto fulcra, because they are not democratically elected, yet they determine what news is shared, to whom, and how, by vetoing the people and information which are presented on their platforms, meanwhile governments are deciding which media platforms are even legal. (70) Likewise, governance of artificial intelligence (AI) must be similarly scrutinized using the veto fulcrum, to ensure that data collected from the people which is being used to generate AI is given freely with informed consent and used in a fair and just way. (71) Finally, in the sphere of global health, the veto players who determine funding for projects in the Global South are usually donors from the Global North. (72)

As with the CRC, when a health or other good governance policy does not pass, or alternately, when a policy passes which contravenes health, environmental, or climate protection, it is important to start asking questions. This research proposes that the veto fulcrum is an instrument which can answer the questions. Identifying and analyzing the actors at the veto fulcrum and the influences on them should be considered in all global policies, including other democracies, and other state and international institutions. Firstly, by examining health policies and other governance decisions using a veto fulcrum framework approach, policy analysts can identify these undemocratic processes and begin to challenge them. It is essential to ask five questions: 1) who is at the veto fulcrum, 2) how did they get there, 3) who is influencing them, 4) what is their position on the issue, and 5) can they be moved on the issue? Secondarily, in undemocratic systems where veto players are appointed or self-appointed (as in private actors, dictatorships, de facto governments), the veto fulcrum can be a starting point to challenge the political system towards ensuring veto players are fairly and democratically elected, and work towards the betterment of one health.

## Conclusion

This study revealed that the process within the American political system for ratification of the CRC – and indeed, for all international human rights treaties - is obstructed by the treaty ratification process itself, allowing single actors as veto players to exert absolute decision-making power on issues which affect the lives of their constituents. The veto fulcrum is a new policy evaluation framework which can critically analyze health and other good governance policies to ensure health policies are decided fairly and in the best interest of the people, particularly the most vulnerable people.

## Data availability statement

Interview transcript data is protected, as agreed by informant consent and confidentiality agreement.

## Ethics statements

### Patient consent for publication

Not applicable. Patients were not involved.

### Ethics approval

This research has received ethical approval from the London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine's (LSHTM) MSc Research Ethics committee ID#28417 and qualifies for exemption under "Research Involving Human Subjects Eligible for Exemption Under 45 CFR 46.104(d)", Chart 4 from the US Department of Health and Human Services Human Subject Regulations. Documentation from both institutions is available. Participants gave informed consent to participate in the study either as signed consent, or verbally at the beginning of the recorded interview before taking part, and all participants consented for their names, professions, and quoted material to be published.

## Contributors

This study topic was originally a master's thesis research project. LH conceptualised the research design and proposal, collected data, undertook the analysis, and wrote the

manuscript. I acknowledge the invaluable contributions of project module organizer, Alexandra Conseil, and project supervisor, Dr. Rachel Hammonds, as well as the study participants, as this manuscript would not have been possible without their time and expertise. Lia Harris/LH is the guarantor.

## Funding

This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial, or not-for profit sectors.

## Competing interests

There are no competing interests for the author.

## References and Citations

1. OHCHR [Internet]. [cited 2022 Oct 21]. Convention on the Rights of the Child. Available from: https://www.ohchr.org/en/instruments-mechanisms/instruments/convention-rights-child

2. Nations U. United Nations. United Nations; [cited 2022 Oct 21]. Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Available from: https://www.un.org/en/about-us/universal-declaration-of-human-rights

3. Constitution of the World Health Organization [Internet]. [cited 2022 Oct 21]. Available from: https://www.who.int/about/governance/constitution

4. The `Punitive Turn' in Juvenile Justice: Cultures of Control and Rights Compliance in Western Europe and the USA - John Muncie, 2008 [Internet]. [cited 2023 Jul 5]. Available from: https://journals-sagepub-com.ez.lshtm.ac.uk/doi/abs/10.1177/1473225408091372

5. Engman M. And Then There Were Two: Why Is the United States One of Only Two Countries in the World That Has Not Ratified the Convention on the Rights of the Child. DePaul Int'l Hum Rts J. 2015;1:[i].

6. Blanchfield L. The United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child. The United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child.

7. Tait CA, Parnia A, Zewge-Abubaker N, Wong WH, Smith-Cannoy H, Siddiqi A. Did the UN convention on the rights of the child reduce child mortality around the world? An interrupted time series analysis. BMC Public Health. 2020 May 18;20:707.

8. Why should the united states ratify the convention on the rights of the child? CHILD WELFARE. 2010 Oct 9;89(5):7–13.

9. Putting Human Rights at the Center of U.S. Foreign Policy [Internet]. United States Department of State. [cited 2023 Jun 21]. Available from: https://www.state.gov/putting-human-rights-at-the-center-of-u-s-foreign-policy/

10. Browning DS, Witte J Jr. Christianity's Mixed Contributions to Children's Rights. Zygon®. 2011;46(3):713–32.

11. U.S. Senate: About Treaties [Internet]. [cited 2022 Oct 21]. Available from: https://www.senate.gov/about/powers-procedures/treaties.htm

12. Debate Transcript□:: 2008 Walden University Presidential Youth Debate [Internet]. [cited 2022 Aug 4]. Available from: http://www.youthdebate2008.org/debate-transcript

13. Rep. Omar I [D M 5. H.Res.854 - 116th Congress (2019-2020): Expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the United States should become a state party to the United

Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child. [Internet]. 2020 [cited 2023 Aug 2]. Available from: http://www.congress.gov/bill/116th-congress/house-resolution/854

14. Poll Results: Convention on the Rights of the Child - First Focus on Children [Internet]. 2009 [cited 2023 Jul 16]. Available from: https://firstfocus.org/resources/polling-and-opinion-research/poll-results-convention-rights-child-2

15. Fact Sheet: Voters Strongly Support Making Investments in Our Children and Grandchildren - First Focus on Children [Internet]. [cited 2023 Aug 14]. Available from: https://firstfocus.org/blog/fact-sheet-voters-support-investments-in-kids

16. Most Americans support family-friendly policies, including paid leave and child care subsidies | YouGov [Internet]. [cited 2023 Jul 16]. Available from: https://today.yougov.com/topics/politics/articles-reports/2023/02/15/most-americans-support-family-friendly-policies

17. Jenkins A, Hsu KS. American Ideals & (and) Human Rights: Findings from New Public Opinion Research by the Opportunity Agenda. Fordham L Rev. 2008 2009;77:439.

18. WALT G, GILSON L. Reforming the health sector in developing countries: the central role of policy analysis. Health Policy and Planning. 1994 Dec 1;9(4):353–70.

19. Tsebelis G. Veto Players: How Political Institutions Work [Internet]. Princeton University Press; 2002 [cited 2023 Jul 28]. Available from: https://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt7rvv7

20. Cooke A, Smith D, Booth A. Beyond PICO: The SPIDER Tool for Qualitative Evidence Synthesis. Qual Health Res. 2012 Oct 1;22(10):1435–43.

21. Paez A. Gray literature: An important resource in systematic reviews. Journal of Evidence-Based Medicine. 2017;10(3):233–40.

22. Greenhalgh T, Peacock R. Effectiveness and efficiency of search methods in systematic reviews of complex evidence: audit of primary sources. BMJ. 2005 Nov 3;331(7524):1064–5.

23. PRISMA [Internet]. [cited 2023 Jul 29]. Available from: http://www.prisma-statement.org/PRISMAStatement/FlowDiagram

24. Snowball Sampling: A Purposeful Method of Sampling in Qualitative Research [Internet]. [cited 2022 Oct 28]. Available from: https://sdme.kmu.ac.ir/article_90598.html

25. Guest G, Bunce A, Johnson L. How Many Interviews Are Enough? Field Methods - FIELD METHOD. 2006 Feb 1;18:59–82.

26. VitalSource Bookshelf: Qualitative Methods for Health Research [Internet]. [cited 2023 Apr 26]. Available from: https://online.vitalsource.com/reader/books/9781526448798/epubcfi/6/36[%3Bvnd.vst.idref

%3Ds9781526448828.i1042]!/4/2[s9781526448828.i1042]/22[s9781526448828.i1119]/14[s9781526448828.i1122]/2/1:34[ewi%2Cng]

27. Charmaz K. Teaching Theory Construction With Initial Grounded Theory Tools: A Reflection on Lessons and Learning. Qual Health Res. 2015 Dec 1;25(12):1610–22.

28. Glaser BG, Strauss AL. Discovery of Grounded Theory: Strategies for Qualitative Research. Routledge; 2017. 282 p.

29. CASP - Critical Appraisal Skills Programme [Internet]. [cited 2023 Jul 22]. CASP Checklists - Critical Appraisal Skills Programme. Available from: https://casp-uk.net/casp-tools-checklists/

30. Ezzy D. Qualitative Analysis [Internet]. Florence, UNITED KINGDOM: Taylor & Francis Group; 2003 [cited 2023 Aug 7]. Available from: http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/lshtmuk/detail.action?docID=1486976

31. Kilbourne S. Placing the Convention on the Rights of the Child in an American Context. Human Rights. 1999;26(2):27–31.

32. Becker J. America Should Not Lag Behind on Protecting Children [Internet]. Human Rights Watch. 2019 [cited 2022 Sep 14]. Available from: https://www.hrw.org/news/2019/11/18/america-should-not-lag-behind-protecting-children

33. PenguinRandomhouse.com [Internet]. [cited 2023 Aug 14]. A Minor Revolution by Adam Benforado: 9781984823045 | PenguinRandomHouse.com: Books. Available from: https://www.penguinrandomhouse.com/books/599501/a-minor-revolution-by-adam-benforado/

34. Treaty Ratification [Internet]. American Civil Liberties Union. [cited 2023 Apr 14]. Available from: https://www.aclu.org/issues/human-rights/treaty-ratification

35. BARTHOLET E. Ratification by the United States of the Convention on the Rights of the Child: Pros and Cons from a Child's Rights Perspective. The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science. 2011;633:80–101.

36. Kasper J. Pediatricians and the Rights of the Child. UN Convention provides blueprint for monitoring the well-being of children worldwide. Pediatr Ann. 2004 Oct;33(10):712–5.

37. Aber JL, Hammond AS, Thompson SM. U.s. Ratification of the crc and reducing child poverty: can we get there from here? CHILD WELFARE. 2010 Oct 9;89(5):159–75.

38. Gautam KC. Time for usa to ratify the child rights convention. CHILD WELFARE. 2010 Oct 9;89(5):221–4.

39. Haggerty RJ. The Convention on the Rights of the Child: It's Time for the United States to Ratify. Pediatrics. 1994 Nov 1;94(5):746–7.

40. Kaufman NH. Human Rights Treaties and the Senate | University of North Carolina Press ~ Natalie Hevener Kaufman | Preview [Internet]. [cited 2023 Aug 4]. Available from: https://flexpub.com/preview/human-rights-treaties-and-the-senate

41. Rutkow L, Lozman JT. Suffer the Children: A Call for United States Ratification of the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child. Harv Hum Rts J. 2006;19:161.

42. Henkin L. U.S. Ratification of Human Rights Conventions: The Ghost of Senator Bricker. The American Journal of International Law. 1995;89(2):341–50.

43. Neumayer E. Qualified Ratification: Explaining Reservations to International Human Rights Treaties [Internet]. Rochester, NY; 2006 [cited 2023 Apr 15]. Available from: https://papers.ssrn.com/abstract=822165

44. Anthropology S for M. The Rights of Children. Medical Anthropology Quarterly. 2007;21(2):234–8.

45. obo [Internet]. [cited 2023 Jul 23]. American Exceptionalism. Available from: https://www.oxfordbibliographies.com/display/document/obo-9780199827251/obo-9780199827251-0176.xml

46. Donnolo P, Azzarelli KK. Ignoring the Human Rights of Children: A Prespective on America's Failure to Ratify the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child. JL & Pol'y. 1996 1997;5:203.

47. Weissbrodt D. Prospects for Ratification of the Convention on the Rights of the Child. Emory Int'l L Rev. 2006;20:209.

48. Todres J. Emerging Limitations on the Rights of the Child: The U.N. Convention on the Rights of the Child and Its Early Case Law. Colum Hum Rts L Rev. 1998 1999;30:159.

49. Scherrer J. The United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child as Policy and Strategy for Social Work Action in Child Welfare in the United States. SOC WORK. 2012 Jan;57(1):11–22.

50. Wagner JT. Child Rights in the United States: Dilemmas and Questions. In: Višnjić-Jevtić A, Sadownik AR, Engdahl I, editors. Young Children in the World and Their Rights: Thirty Years with the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child [Internet]. Cham: Springer International Publishing; 2021 [cited 2023 Apr 12]. p. 31–41. (International Perspectives on Early Childhood Education and Development). Available from: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-68241-5_3

51. Rep. Yatron G [D P 6. H.Res.312 - 101st Congress (1989-1990): Urging the President to submit the Convention on the Rights of the Child to the Senate for its advice and consent to ratification. [Internet]. 1990 [cited 2023 Aug 5]. Available from: http://www.congress.gov/bill/101st-congress/house-resolution/312

52. Stentzel LLI. Prospects for United States Ratification of the Convention on the Rights of the Child. Wash & Lee L Rev. 1991;48:1285.

53. Sen. Bradley B [D N. S.Res.231 - 101st Congress (1989-1990): A resolution urging the submission of the Convention on the Rights of the Child to the Senate for its advice and consent to ratification. [Internet]. 1990 [cited 2023 Aug 5]. Available from: http://www.congress.gov/bill/101st-congress/senate-resolution/231

54. Renteln AD. Who's Afraid of the CRC: Objections to the Convention on the Rights of the Child. ILSA J Int'l & Comp L. 1996 1997;3:629.

55. Kilbourne S. U.S. Failure to Ratify the U.N. Convention on the Rights of the Child: Playing Politics with Children's Rights. Transnat'l L & Contemp Probs. 1996;6:437.

56. Kaufman NH, Whiteman D. Opposition to Human Rights Treaties in the United States Senate: The Legacy of the Bricker Amendment. Human Rights Quarterly. 1988 Aug;10(3):309.

57. Sen. DeMint J [R S. Text - S.Res.99 - 112th Congress (2011-2012): A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that the primary safeguard for the well-being and protection of children is the family, and that the primary safeguards for the legal rights of children in the United States are the Constitutions of the United States and the several States, and that, because the use of international treaties to govern policy in the United States on families and children is contrary to principles of self-government and federalism, and that, because the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child undermines traditional principles of law in the United States regarding parents and children, the President should not transmit the Convention to the Senate for its advice and consent. [Internet]. 2011 [cited 2023 Jun 23]. Available from: http://www.congress.gov/bill/112th-congress/senate-resolution/99/text

58. Alliance Defending Freedom. In: Wikipedia [Internet]. 2023 [cited 2023 Aug 13]. Available from: https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Alliance_Defending_Freedom&oldid=1170031139

59. Løvdal Stephens H. Family matters: James Dobson and Focus on the Family's crusade for the Christian home. Tuscaloosa: The University of Alabama Press; 2019. 291 p. (Religion and American culture (Tuscaloosa, Ala.)).

60. Macmillan [Internet]. [cited 2023 Aug 29]. The Jesus Machine. Available from: https://us.macmillan.com/books/9780312378448/thejesusmachine

61. Tong A, Sainsbury P, Craig J. Consolidated criteria for reporting qualitative research (COREQ): a 32-item checklist for interviews and focus groups. International Journal for Quality in Health Care. 2007 Dec 1;19(6):349–57.

62. Human Rights Watch [Internet]. 2023 [cited 2023 Sep 7]. How Do US States Measure Up on Child Rights? Available from: https://www.hrw.org/feature/2022/09/13/how-do-states-measure-up-child-rights

63. UN Treaties [Internet]. [cited 2023 Jul 21]. Available from: https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/TreatyBodyExternal/Treaty.aspx?CountryID=187&Lang=en

64. Gilens M, Page BI. Testing Theories of American Politics: Elites, Interest Groups, and Average Citizens. Perspectives on Politics. 2014 Sep;12(3):564–81.

65. Clark CS, Paluck EL, Westwood SJ, Sen M, Malhotra N, Jessee S. Effects of a US Supreme Court ruling to restrict abortion rights. Nat Hum Behav. 2024 Jan;8(1):63–71.

66. Kazyak E, Burke K, Behrendt M, Oliver M. Religious Exemption, LGBT Rights, and the Social Construction of Harm and Freedom. Law & Social Inquiry. 2024 May;49(2):980–1003.

67. archive.ph [Internet]. 2021 [cited 2023 Aug 13]. How Michael P. Farris Tried to Block 2020 Election Outcome - The New …. Available from: https://archive.ph/tzhnx

68. Project 2025 | Presidential Transition Project [Internet]. [cited 2024 Sep 4]. Available from: https://www.project2025.org/

69. Library DH. Research Guides: UN Security Council Meetings & Outcomes Tables: Vetoes [Internet]. United Nations. Dag Hammarskjöld Library; [cited 2024 Mar 20]. Available from: https://research.un.org/en/docs/sc/quick/veto

70. Rep. McCaul MT [R T 10. H.R.8038 - 118th Congress (2023-2024): 21st Century Peace through Strength Act [Internet]. 2024 [cited 2024 Jun 30]. Available from: https://www.congress.gov/bill/118th-congress/house-bill/8038

71. Titcomb J, Warrington J. OpenAI warns copyright crackdown could doom ChatGPT. The Telegraph [Internet]. 2024 Jan 7 [cited 2024 Sep 5]; Available from: https://www.telegraph.co.uk/business/2024/01/07/openai-warns-copyright-crackdown-could-doom-chatgpt/

72. Funders: The missing link in equitable global health research? | PLOS Global Public Health [Internet]. [cited 2024 Sep 4]. Available from: https://journals.plos.org/globalpublichealth/article?id=10.1371/journal.pgph.0000583

**Figure 1: Health Policy Triangle from Walt and Gilson** (18)



**Figure 2: How Veto Players and Process Obstruct Ratification**



**Figure 3: Moving the Veto Fulcrum**