



Sovereign Law Series

Independent System for International Law Sources

Introduction Report:

The Keys to Reclaiming International Law

June 2023 Edition

<https://ignitaveritasunited.org>

© 2020, 2023 Sovereign Court of International Justice (SCIJ). All International Rights Reserved.

The 1979 “Berne Convention” fully protects this proprietary collection as a selection and arrangement of works (Art. 2.5), and protects these documents as derivative works (Art. 2.3) and adaptations (Art. 12). All unauthorized republication or distribution including online is illegal (Art. 9). “Fair Use” does not permit infringement for unfair competition by another non-profit (17 USC 107), which is a criminal offense punishable by 10 years imprisonment (18 USC 241; UK Copyright Act §107).

Introduction to Sovereign Law Series

The Sovereign Court of International Justice (SCIJ) presents its “Sovereign Law Series”, a proprietary system for accessible and effective use of international law sources by private researchers and Rights Advocates, the Independent Legal Profession and Independent Judiciary Profession, consisting of:

- (1) Curated collection of primary sources of conventional international law;
- (2) Copies of source texts specially formatted for researchers and Rights Advocates, Barristers and Judges to best use this system, and
- (3) Universal standardized reference system for citing international law sources for practical use;

This “Sovereign Law Series” provides the primary sources of the modern framework of “conventional international law”, which contains provisions to invoke historical “customary international law”, which is the “Common Law”.

These selected sources are the operative instruments recognizing established doctrines of fundamental rights and the Rule of Law internationally.

This presents the essential body of law for national sovereignty, which independent States, intergovernmental organizations (IGO's), and sovereign historical institutions must rely upon, to assert and exercise their official authorities, while maintaining independence from globalist establishment systems.

This is also the essential body of law for human rights and civil liberties, which the People must know and rely upon to assert their rights, empowering individuals to invoke the supra-governmental authority of international law for the People.

The Keys to Reclaiming International Law

Professor Matthew Bennett, Barrister

J.D., Ph.D., D.Sc., J.S.D., J.C.D.

King's Counsel (K.C.), Privy Councillor (P.C.)

Royal Alliance of Independent States (RAIS)

Inspector General – Chief of Judiciary Security

Ignita Veritas United (IVU) Inter-Governmental Organization (IGO)

Exposing Problems & Revealing Solutions

The Problem Threatening Humanity

The past 75 years of propaganda (since 1945), promoted by establishment mainstream media and career politicians, has misled humanity to closely associate international law and human rights with the United Nations (UN), as a supposed source or protector of rights. Meanwhile, the UN has increasingly discredited itself, by its own actions progressively undermining the same law and rights which it claims to represent.

As a result, most of the People are discouraged from looking to the framework of international law conventions, which are actually the best mainstream source for most easily and effectively proving and invoking human rights and national sovereignty.

Perhaps the only real positive contribution of the United Nations, was that it served as a forum for all territorial countries of the world to recognize and codify the universal rules of international law into adopted conventions.

However, having established its reputation upon mainstream propaganda giving it credit for the conventions restating real law and rights, the UN only proceeded to persistently subvert and suppress that same body of law and rights, by its actions.

The Peoples of the Nations have watched the UN and its agencies systematically dismantling all fundamental rights, basic freedoms, and national sovereignty, through incessant “programs” and “initiatives” following “policy goals”, promoting “agendas” of private political factions of elitist special interest groups, against the will of humanity.

While claimed to be supposed “guidelines” or “non-binding recommendations”, those UN agendas are routinely made binding, forced upon the People as “mandatory”, by national statutory legislation of the countries deceived by that propaganda.

The People have seen how those agendas, pushed through and implemented by ignorant (or corrupt) politicians violating their constitutions, increasingly seek to control all of humanity by a tyrannical “global governance”, a euphemism which is diametrically (and diabolically) opposed to the conventions of true international law declaring the rights of democratic self-governance of peoples.

The most insidious and destructive evil is always done in the name of good. Humanity was warned about this by ancient Scriptures: “Woe unto them that call evil good, and good evil” (Isaiah 5:20).

The 19th century Marie von Ebner-Eschenbach, Countess of Moravia (Czech), thus reminded the world that “Little evil would be done in the world, if evil never could be done in the name of good.” (Aphorisms 1880, Ariadne Press)

True to that warning, elitist political factions apparently controlling the UN have actively misled the countries of the world, in the name of the “good” declared in the international law conventions, to deceive them into forcing upon the People every form of evil as “policies” of “globalism”, which flagrantly violate those same conventions, which are abused as a mere distraction to camouflage evil as “good”.

Only as long as those conventions are wholly disregarded, can such “policies” continue to dismantle all human rights and replace them with tyranny. However, if the conventions are actually used, then such agendas will be forcefully stopped by the will of the People.

University Law Faculty courses in “International Law”, purporting to train “International Lawyers”, typically teach extensive theoretical analyses of potential “sources of international law”, and usually teach the UN mechanisms for administration of relations between countries.

However, law schools rarely teach any of the actual conventions which have recognized and codified the real universal rights and obligations of international law. Moreover, law schools never teach how to effectively invoke and enforce such rights.

As a result, most Lawyers, and even most Judges (who generally come from the same legal profession), are left wholly unprepared to uphold and defend human rights and national sovereignty using the supremacy power of real international law.

Private Legal Research groups of academics have arisen and multiplied, to fill the void left by the lack of access to Justice for individuals in the UN system, and the scarcity of Lawyers qualified to use real human rights law in the Legal Profession.

Under escalating pressure of rampant human rights violations imposed by statutory laws, and deprived of access to Lawyers capable of resisting, such groups pursue “Common Law” theories to overcome unlawful practices of corrupt legal systems, seeking some form of “sovereignty” to demand restoration of their Common Law human rights.

However, such researchers feel discouraged from studying the conventions confirming real international law, because propaganda has associated this with the discredited “UN system”. This prevents them from discovering that Common Law rights are actually reconfirmed in the universal conventions of international law, which all countries of the world have already accepted as binding and enforceable.

As a result, even the most experienced Common Law research groups, are deprived of the essential legal knowledge which would empower them to reclaim and restore the individual benefits of human rights and national sovereignty.

The Solution Empowering Humanity

This “Sovereign Law Series” is provided by the Sovereign Court of International Justice (SCIJ), an intergovernmental organization (IGO), revealing and giving the “Keys to Reclaiming International Law”.

These “Keys” are a working system for using the necessary framework of real law and rights, in the most concise format for real-world practical use, which all Lawyers, Judges, Rights Advocates, researchers, and other individuals, can finally rely upon to demand and compel meaningful enforcement of the Rule of Law.

Finally, for the first time in modern history since the medieval Magna Carta, instead of corrupt politicians of countries imposing oppression and tyranny upon humanity, the Peoples of the Nations can use these “Keys” to impose the true Rule of Law upon their corrupt politicians, to reclaim their sovereign countries.

Escaping “Problem-Reaction-Solution”

The Weapon of Corrupt Agendas

The past decades of corrupt agendas, systematically dismantling human rights and sovereignty, are primarily driven by a strategy called the “Hegelian Dialectic”. A “dialectic” can be defined as essentially a strategy of applying logical arguments.

This particular strategy is named after the philosopher Georg Hegel, who actually criticized it being used by his contemporary Immanuel Kant ca. 1800 AD (Walter Kaufmann, Hegel: A Reinterpretation, Anchor Books, 1966, p.154).

The “Hegelian Dialectic” was classically described as the applied process of “Thesis – Antithesis – Synthesis”, and is best and most popularly described, in modern political terms, as a strategy of “Problem – Reaction – Solution”:

1. **“Problem”** – First, government officials and mainstream media actively promote a “Problem”. This can be an artificially manufactured crisis, a false-flag or misrepresented crisis, or the result of government policies causing or enabling a crisis. The Problem always creates a perceived need for some form of public safety;

2. **“Reaction”** – Next, politicians and media promote the desired public “Reaction”, in response to the promoted Problem. This Reaction can be a false manufactured consensus, enforced by censorship of all dissent, supposedly demanding that the government “do something” to resolve the crisis. The Reaction is always based upon a presumed demand for some form of public safety;

3. **“Solution”** – Finally, the government offers its own “Solution”, in response to the promoted Reaction to the Problem. This Solution inevitably and invariably consists of more statutory laws, creating more government powers for control, always directly at the expense of the People, reducing them to fewer rights. The Solution is always based upon some form of mandatory measures, requiring “compliance”, by a loss of rights, all claimed to be necessary for public safety.

Precisely to call upon humanity to reject and oppose this Hegelian Dialectic strategy, the 18th century American statesman Benjamin Franklin famously warned: “Those who would give up essential liberty, to purchase a little temporary safety, deserve neither liberty nor safety.” President Thomas Jefferson later restated this warning as: “He who gives his freedom for safety gets none of them.”

The deception of the “Problem-Reaction-Solution” strategy is the most insidious method of progressively imposing evil in the name of good:

The “Problem” is usually caused by the failed or purposely destructive government policies of corrupt politicians. The “Reaction” is always manipulated and driven by propaganda from the same politicians. The “Solution” is always the planned political agenda of the same corrupt politicians who created the “Problem”.

This method follows the traditional motto of various elitist political factions, documented in the historical record: “Order out of Chaos”.

That means to intentionally manipulate events to create a crisis, which is then used to deceive and coerce the People to submit to a “New World Order” of global governance, abandoning fundamental rights and freedoms, all for the false promise of security.

That philosophy was reportedly described by Winston Churchill ca. 1944, in connection with formation of the United Nations (which was the planned “solution” to the manipulated “problem” of World War II), as: “Never let a good crisis go to waste.”

Most importantly, the results of every “Problem-Reaction-Solution” cycle always only go in one direction: More power and control for government, and less rights and liberties for the People.

To progressively impose complete tyranny, it is only necessary to repeat that cycle, by causing or enabling a series of new crises, until the government has complete dictatorial power, and the People are left with no human rights at all.

Moreover, once a government holds dominant power, it never voluntarily relinquishes that power, nor restores the rights given up by the People for false promises.

Precisely to prepare humanity to resist such progressive tyranny, the 19th century American Civil War statesman and slavery abolitionist Frederick Douglass warned:

“Power concedes nothing without a demand. It never did and it never will. Find out just what any people will quietly submit to and you have found out the exact measure of injustice and wrong which will be imposed upon them, and these will continue till they are resisted with either words or blows [violence], or with both. The limits of tyrants are prescribed by the endurance of those whom they oppress.”

Rule of Law as Defensive Weapon

Many patriot groups, individuals and independent media have explained the dangers of “Problem-Reaction-Solution” as a political weapon for dismantling rights. However, no research has ever explained how international law can be used as the defensive legal weapon for restoring and preserving rights.

The time has come to reveal this here and now:

The “Problem” is usually artificially created by the State to advance a political agenda against humanity, and creating such a Problem is almost always a major violation of international law and rights.

Despite the cause already being illegal, the propaganda-driven “Reaction” is generally to demand enacting more statutory laws giving the government more powers for security, and the agenda-driven “Solution” is always for the People to give up more rights for the false promise of security.

However, if the Reaction of the People is to reject the false propaganda, and instead aggressively demand enforcing international law to stop the real underlying cause of the Problem, then the claimed “Problem” can be eliminated, the false “Reaction” is replaced by the Rule of Law, and the planned false “Solution” is prevented.

Therefore, the only correct Reaction – and the absolutely necessary Reaction – in all cases must be to demand strict enforcement of international law and rights, to stop the real cause of the original Problem, by the full force of the Rule of Law.

If the People repeatedly and reliably reacted by insisting upon the Rule of Law every time, setting precedent establishing a deterrent, then all subversive agendas against rights would effectively be destroyed.

Examples for Typical Situations

For the above counter-strategy of the real Reaction being to demand international law and rights, we can identify several typical examples as illustrations:

Terrorism – If the “Problem” threatening a State is terrorism, then the real cause will usually be State-sponsored mercenaries created and promoted by that same State as the terrorists, which violates international law.

The promoted “Reaction” will be to demand more laws for security. The offered “Solution” will be to enact laws treating all citizens as if they were terrorists, while continuing to sponsor the actual terrorists.

However, if the real Reaction is instead to demand enforcement of international law against the violating State for creating and supporting terrorism, then the citizens will retain their rights.

Pandemic – If the “Problem” threatening a State is some form of medical pandemic of a disease, then the real cause will usually be State-sponsored bio-weapons laboratory development of that virus enabled and promoted by that same State as a pandemic, which violates international law.

The promoted “Reaction” will be to demand laws supporting vaccines. The offered “Solution” will be to enact laws quarantining all citizens unless they take mandatory vaccines, while continuing to sponsor creating more viruses.

However, if the real Reaction is instead to demand enforcement of international law against the violating State for creating bio-weapons, then the citizens will retain their freedoms.

Mass Shootings – If the “Problem” is persistent “mass shootings” with firearms, then the real cause will usually be the State creating the “shooters” by propaganda damaging human relationships imposing mental suffering, promoting dangerous psychiatric medications, and not enforcing laws which already make unlicensed guns illegal, all violating international law.

The promoted “Reaction” will be to demand more “gun control” laws. The offered “Solution” will be to enact laws abolishing all rights to self-defense, “banning” all firearms for law-abiding citizens, while continuing to create more shooters who can obtain unlicensed firearms illegally.

However, if the real Reaction is instead to demand enforcement of international law against the violating State for creating dangerous mental patients and not enforcing existing laws, then the citizens will retain their rights of self-defense.

Under-Population – If the “Problem” is national “declining population” from fewer and smaller families, then the real cause will be the State promoting propaganda damaging male-female relations while imposing intolerable economic conditions, thus preventing marriages and establishment of families, all violating international law.

The promoted “Reaction” will be to demand laws for “open borders”. The offered “Solution” will be laws mandating mass foreign “replacement migration”, while continuing to sabotage marriage and families.

However, if the real Reaction is instead to demand enforcement of international law against the violating State for depriving citizens of human rights, then new families will form and thrive.

Over-Population – If the “Problem” is perceived world “over-population” disproportionate to resources, then the real cause will be States promoting propaganda and economic oppression creating “artificial scarcity” of resources, violating international law.

The promoted “Reaction” will be to demand laws for “population control”. The offered “Solution” will be laws mandating “population reduction” by imposing conditions adverse to health and restricting access to effective medical care, while continuing to artificially suppress resources.

However, if the real Reaction is instead to demand enforcement of international law against the violating State for suppressing abundant resources, then a growing population will be well supported.

The logic of these examples compellingly proves that the most strategically effective and powerful defensive legal weapon, as the remedy for the incessant escalation of statutory laws eroding human rights and sovereignty, is the strict and forceful application of real and existing international law, by and for the People.

Real Sources of International Law

For learning the most effective practical use of international law, to assert and enforce rights and sovereignty, it is necessary to begin with awareness of only the following basic definitions of the primary sources of international law:

“Customary international law” is the body of over 5,000 years of historical “customs” (since ca. 3,000 BC), used and practiced by countries and also by non-territorial States (such as historical sovereign institutions), evidencing legal and historical precedents proving rules of international law and rights;

“Common Law” is the body of over 800 years of jurisprudence (since the Magna Carta ca. 1215 AD), established as “common” to the Peoples of the Nations, evidenced by legal scholarship and Judiciary precedents proving universal doctrines of law and rights, all based upon customary international law;

“Conventional international law” is the body of the past 75 years of modern “conventions” (since ca. 1945 AD), adopted and accepted by modern countries as territorial States, recognizing and codifying rules of customary international law, which are also doctrines of the Common Law.

As a result, the primary source of the modern framework of international law is “conventional” law of the international “conventions”, which recognize the rules of “customary law” of historical “customs”, which also establish Common Law rights.

For these reasons, the present collection of conventional law, with Judiciary commentary on customary law and Common Law, is named the “Sovereign Law Series”.

The concept of “Sovereign Law” expresses the reality that these sources of international law embody the universal law and rights which establish the legal sovereignty of territorial and non-territorial States, and also the moral “sovereignty” of the People as individuals with inalienable human rights in natural law.

Reclaiming Law & Rights for the People

Independence from the United Nations

The United Nations (UN) is not a “world government”, and has no authority for any type of “global governance”:

The UN was established with an inherently limited role, required to uphold “rights of self-determination of peoples” ([UN Charter](#), Article 1.2) and “sovereign equality” of States (Article 2.1), and is specifically prohibited “to intervene in... the domestic jurisdiction of any State” (Article 2.7).

Indeed, conventional law recognizes that “the rule of law applies... equally... [to] the United Nations” which is “accountable” for any of its own violations of international law and rights (2012 [Declaration on Rule of Law](#), Article 2).

The UN is not a “world parliament”, and has no authority to enact any form of “legislation”:

The UN General Assembly (GA) has a limited role, only as a forum for States to declare their sovereign recognition of “international law and its codification”, confirming customary doctrines of “international cooperation... human rights and fundamental freedoms” ([UN Charter](#), Article 13.1).

International Law Belongs to the People

The UN has no authority to “own” or “control” international law:

All conventions and declarations are actually created by the “Negotiating States”, such that the UN is only a “Depositary” (1969 [Law of Treaties](#), Articles 1(e), 76.1). For UN Member States, “every international agreement” is merely “registered” with the UN only to be “published by it” and to “invoke” it within UN forums (1969 [Law of Treaties](#), Article 80; [UN Charter](#), Article 102).

The resulting agreements thus belong to the Peoples of the Nations, constituting a public record in the public domain, such that the UN does not hold copyrights. The UN confirms that “With regard to treaties and conventions... each individual text is in the public domain”, and thus only a formatted and curated “collection” can be subject to copyright (UN Shop: [Rights & Permissions](#)).

Conventions of international law are not “enacted” as “laws”, thus cannot be “repealed”; Related rights are not “granted”, thus cannot be “revoked”; Rights once “recognized”, can never be “un-recognized”:

Declared “rights” in a convention thus “may not be revoked or modified” (1969 [Law of Treaties](#), Articles 36.1, 37.2), and “become binding upon” all States, including non-signatories, as a “customary rule of international law” which is “recognized” by that convention (Article 38).

Therefore, all law and rights evidenced in international conventions belong to the Peoples of the Nations, and can be invoked by the People and enforced by the Independent Judiciary Profession, in perpetuity.

Common Law Rights as Customary Law

Know Your Rights to Use Not Lose Them

For rights to be enjoyed and preserved, they must be used: This is perhaps best expressed by the folk wisdom saying “Use it or lose it”.

The modern dominance of national statutory laws has obscured and distracted from many millennia of true jurisprudence of Common Law rights and the Rule of Law in “customary international law”. This has caused even the legal profession to forget how to defend fundamental rights, and has misled the People to forget which inalienable natural rights they actually have.

The Universal Declaration of Human Rights warns that “it is essential, if man is not to be compelled to have recourse... to rebellion against tyranny and oppression, that human rights should be protected by the rule of law” (1948 [Human Rights](#), Preamble: ¶13). For this purpose, it emphasizes that “a common understanding of these rights and freedoms is of the greatest importance” (Preamble: ¶17).

For rights to be enforced, they must first be known, and then actively asserted:

A doctrine of customary law holds that “*Vigilantibus et non dormientibus jura subveniunt*”, or “Law serves the vigilant, not those who sleep upon their rights” ([Bouvier’s Law](#) 1914, 3rd, V.1, “Equity”, p.1063).

This doctrine is the basis for the rule “*Non ultra petita*”, or “Not beyond the request”, by which a Court usually cannot uphold rights which are not invoked (2002 ICJ [Congo v. Belgium](#), §43).

Therefore, the People, and especially members of the Independent Legal Profession, must read and learn the conventions in this “Sovereign Law Series”, which recognize customary international law, to know and demand enforcement of Common Law rights, from the super-governmental level of “conventional international law”.

Invoking Customary and Common Law

The timeless doctrines of jurisprudence since ancient times, which became Magna Carta rights, enshrined as the Common Law, appear to be mostly forgotten in modern times. However, the modern framework of “conventional international law” itself codified universal recognition of historical “customary international law”, which includes the Common Law:

Many of the most important conventions declare that the “rules of customary international law continue to govern”, and are thus enforceable in all countries (1961 [Diplomatic Relations](#), Preamble: ¶15, Article 47.1; 1963 [Consular Relations](#), Preamble: ¶16; 1969 [Special Missions](#), Preamble: ¶18; 2004 [Immunities of States](#), Preamble: ¶15; 1969 [Law of Treaties](#), Preamble: ¶18, Article 38; 2005 [Remedy for Human Rights](#), Article 1).

The doctrines of customary law are also enforceable as “rules... to which they [are] subject under international law independently of [a] convention” (1969 [Law of Treaties](#), Articles 3(b), 43), and as “other sources of international law” (1945 [UN Charter](#), Preamble: ¶13).

Therefore, all of the nations of the world have already reconfirmed and accepted Common Law rights of customary law as binding upon all countries.

As a result, the People, and competent independent Lawyers, can invoke and demand enforcement of those rights, by quoting and citing the above conventional law recognizing customary law.

Establishing Rules of Customary Law

“International Law” is defined as “The customary law... The system of rules and principles, founded on treaty, custom, [and] precedent... which civilized nations recognize as binding upon them” ([Black’s Law](#) 2nd 1910: “International Law”, p.649).

The rules of customary law are those which are established “According to custom or usage” ([Black’s Law](#) 2nd 1910: “Customary”, p.310).

Therefore, any legal doctrines and rights which can be proven, by either legal or historical precedent, constitute rules of “customary law” as Common Law.

Establishing Doctrines of Common Law

“Common Law” is defined as “distinguished from [statutory] law created by... legislatures”, comprised of “the body of those principles and rules... from usages and customs of immemorial antiquity, or from... courts recognizing, affirming, and enforcing such usages and customs... [as] ancient unwritten law” ([Black’s Law](#) 2nd 1910: “Common Law”, pp.226-227).

Therefore, any legal doctrines and rights which can be proven, by either legal or historical precedent, constitute rules of Common Law as “customary law”.

All Countries Bound by International Law

Countries Exist by International Law

In modern times, government officials often attempt to ignore and deny rights and obligations of international law, by claiming “sovereignty” as an excuse to reject international law being applied to their country.

However, this argument is mistaken, and self-destructive, as the claimed “sovereignty” itself is only protected by precisely that same body of international law which is wrongfully denied. Essentially, countries only exist by effect of international law:

The framework of conventional international law is relied upon by all countries, specifically and especially, to enforce the customary law “principle of non-interference in sovereign affairs of States” (1945 [UN Charter](#), Articles 2.1, 2.4; 1970 [Law of Cooperation of States](#), 3rd Principle; 1974 [Economic Rights of States](#), Articles 1, 2.1; 1981 [Internal Affairs of States](#), Article 1; 2004 [Immunities of States](#), Preamble: ¶1).

Therefore, for a government to reject the rights of others under international law, necessarily means to renounce one’s own rights of sovereignty under that same body of international law, in effect abdicating that sovereignty.

Most countries, if they denied the protections of international law, would thereby cause their own declarations of independence and constitutions to be denied, and would immediately have to revert to their former status as a colony or territory of some other country.

No Exception for Defect of Legitimacy

Many Common Law theories present compelling evidence of various defects of legal legitimacy of modern governments, for many countries. Such theories also indicate that such defects give many government officials a secret pseudo-moral justification to disregard real law and rights, using illegitimacy to operate outside of real law.

Such theories and evidence may give a lawful basis for the People to dismantle a false government and restore a genuine constitutional government. However, such defects do **not** allow an illegitimate government to escape the rules, rights and enforcement mechanisms of conventional international law.

Even when proven true, defects of legitimacy are **not** an exception, and **not** any excuse, for a State government to evade or disregard international law.

Every modern territorial State, no matter how corrupt or illegitimate it may be, still holds a seat in the United Nations, and still must engage in diplomatic relations to function in international affairs. All of these roles and functions are wholly dependent upon the codified rules of the framework of conventions of international law.

Therefore, every State, regardless of its form or legitimacy of government, in fact is still reliant and dependent upon the conventions of international law, to assert its claimed sovereignty in all its dealings with other States.

Any country, even with an illegitimate government, if it denied the rules of international law, would thereby cause its own claim or appearance of governance of the country to be denied, and thus would immediately abdicate its diplomatic status and authority to represent the country.

No Denying Law on Which Relying

By the legal doctrine of “Estoppel”, customary law “bars” one from “alleging or denying” legal rights or facts, when one has contradicted that claim by one’s own “previous conduct or admission” ([Black’s Law](#) 2nd 1910: “Estoppel”, p.442).

Thus, a State which asserts its own sovereignty as protected by the framework of international law, is legally barred from denying rights or obligations which are mandated by that same body of international law.

For these reasons, the universal mandate of conventional law is clear, that a State “may not invoke... its internal law as justification for its failure” to comply with international law (1969 [Law of Treaties](#), Article 27).

“[T]he rule of law applies to all States equally”, “all... are accountable”, and “impunity is not tolerated” (2012 [Declaration on Rule of Law](#), Articles 2, 22).

Fully Binding Upon All Countries

The rights and obligations of international law are fully enforceable upon all countries, as “rules... to which they [are] subject under international law independently of [a] convention” (1969 [Law of Treaties](#), Articles 3(b), 43), “becoming binding upon” even non-signatory countries, “as a customary rule of international law, recognized as such” by any convention (Article 38).

Therefore, no country can circumvent human rights law by “opting out” of a convention, nor by ratifying it with “reservations”. Such tactics are only evidence of intent to disregard international law, and thus do not evade – but rather escalate – full liability for violations.

Treaties can be Stricken as Unlawful

There is an important difference between “Conventions”, which recognize and codify universal rights and doctrines of law, and mere “Treaties”, by which countries agree to cooperate in particular matters of governance. Treaties have been increasingly used to impose government policies which actually subvert and violate the conventions of international law.

The Rule of Interpretation of Treaties is that in applying a treaty, it “shall be taken into account... any relevant rules of international law” (1969 [Law of Treaties](#), Article 31.3). When any provision of a treaty “leads to a result which is... unreasonable” by violating international law, it must be interpreted differently to comply with international rights and obligations (Article 32).

The Rule of Preemptory Norms is that “A treaty is void if... it conflicts with a preemptory norm of general international law”, meaning if it violates any prohibitions protecting human rights or national sovereignty (1969 [Law of Treaties](#), Article 53).

By invoking either of the above Rule of Interpretation or Rule of Norms: “The validity of a treaty... may be impeached”, and the treaty thereby declared invalid, for being unlawful (1969 [Law of Treaties](#), Article 42.1); Such treaty “which is in conflict” with international law thus automatically “becomes void and terminates” (Article 64).

In customary law, a “Treaty” is defined as merely an “agreement... or contract” between States ([Black’s Law](#) 2nd 1910: “Treaty”, p.1170).

As a doctrine of customary law, any “contract... is restricted by law” if its provisions are “against public policy”, in which case “the law refuses to enforce or recognize them, on the ground that they have a mischievous tendency”, or impose any “illegality or immorality” ([Black’s Law](#) 2nd 1910: “Policy, Public”, p.910).

A Court can thus declare a contract as “void” for being “unlawful”, if it violates “public policy” of international law or rights ([Black’s Law](#) 2nd 1910: “Unlawful”, p.1187).

Therefore, just as a Civil Court can strike down the whole or parts of a private contract which violates law or rights, a properly formed International Court of the Independent Judiciary can strike down a treaty as a contract which violates international law.

Statutes can be Stricken as Unlawful

The modern dominance of national statutory laws by legislatures has essentially displaced and suppressed many millennia of true jurisprudence of Common Law rights and the Rule of Law in customary law. Statutory laws have been increasingly used to impose government policies which actually subvert and violate the conventions of international law.

It is an established doctrine of customary law, that when any “statute [is] passed in violation of law, that is, of the fundamental law or [a] constitution... it is the prerogative of Courts... to declare it void... to declare it not to be law.” ([Black’s Law](#) 2nd 1910: “Law” §2, p.700)

Therefore, just as a national Supreme Court can strike down the whole or parts of a legislative statute which violates constitutional law or rights, a properly formed International Court of the Independent Judiciary can strike down a statute which violates international law.

Reference System for International Law

It is incorrect to reference international agreements as supposed “United Nations” conventions, because they actually belong to the Peoples of the Nations, developed and adopted by their sovereign States.

Also, the popularized practice of referring to such documents only as a so-called “Geneva Convention” or “Paris Declaration”, etc., is ineffective, because dozens of agreements were adopted at each such city.

Therefore, for such codifications recognizing international law, legal and academic citations of source references should use the following format, as a universal standardized reference system:

- “[City]” indicates to label the reference with the place where the document was adopted;
- “[Year]” means to label with the year when it was first adopted;
- “[Type]” means to label with the type of agreement, i.e. “Convention”, “Declaration”, etc.

- The **Title** should be written either in “**Quotes**” (in legal documents) or **Underlined** (in academia), to indicate that it is the proper name of the Source document.
- **Inline** citations should be in **(Parentheses)**.

Long-Form Reference:

[City] [Type] Longest Formal Official Title of [Year]

i.e. – New York Declaration of Basic Principles of Justice for Victims of Crime and Abuse of Power of 1985.

Short-Form Reference:

[Year] [Type] Shorter Working Title

i.e. – New York Justice for Victims of Crime and Abuse of Power of 1985

In-Line Micro Reference:

([Year] Shortest Title)

i.e. – (1985 Justice for Abuse of Power, Article [#])

This system will provide the most reliable and effective references clearly identifying international agreements, even on the smallest documents with space limitations.

Collection of International Law Sources

Law Directly Protecting Human Rights

This collection represents the central body of international law directly establishing the primary human rights, as codified rules which are universally recognized as enforceable natural rights in Common Law, which are protected and enforceable under international law.

Long-Form Reference	Short-Form Reference	In-Line Micro Reference	Link
Paris “Universal Declaration of Human Rights” of 1948	1948 “Declaration of Human Rights”	(1948 “Human Rights”)	PDF
Geneva “Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees” of 1951	1951 “Convention on Status of Refugees”	(1951 “Status of Refugees”)	PDF
New York “International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination” of 1965	1965 “Convention on Racial Discrimination”	(1965 “Racial Discrimination”)	PDF
New York “International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights” of 1966	1966 “Covenant on Civil & Political Rights”	(1976 “Civil & Political Rights”)	PDF
New York “International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights” of 1966	1966 “Covenant on Economic Social & Cultural Rights”	(1976 “Economic & Social Rights”)	PDF
New York “Convention on the Rights of the Child” of 1989	1989 “Convention on Rights of the Child”	(1989 “Rights of the Child”)	PDF

“Declaration on the Right and Responsibility of Individuals Groups and Organs of Society to Promote and Protect Universally Recognized Human Rights” of 1998	1998 “Declaration on Right to Protect Human Rights”	(1998 “Right to Protect Human Rights”)	PDF
New York “Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples” of 2007	2007 “Declaration on Rights of Indigenous Peoples”	(2007 “Rights of Indigenous Peoples”)	PDF
UN Human Rights Council Resolution “The Right to Education” of 2008	2008 UN-HRC Resolution “Right to Education”	(2008 UN-HRC “Right to Education”)	PDF

Law Indirectly Affecting Human Rights

This collection is the body of international law which indirectly affects human rights, addressing areas of law which are increasingly abused or misapplied to suppress freedom of speech and other human rights. Analysis and proper application of the original rules in these conventions can thus help to restore certain human rights.

Long-Form Reference	Short-Form Reference	In-Line Micro Reference	Link
Geneva “Universal Copyright Convention” of 1971	1971 “Universal Copyright Convention”	(1971 “Copyright Convention”)	PDF
Paris “Berne Convention for the Protection of Literary and Artistic Works” of 1979 [Research & Use]	1979 “Berne Convention for Protection of Works”	(1979 “Berne Convention”)	PDF
Paris “Convention for the Protection of Industrial Property” of 1979 [Trademarks]	1979 “Convention on Industrial Property”	(1979 “Industrial Property”)	PDF

Hague “Convention on the Law Applicable to Trusts and on Their Recognition” of 1985	1985 “Convention on the Law of Trusts”	(1985 “Law of Trusts”)	PDF
---	--	------------------------	---------------------

Law Protecting Sovereignty and Humanity

This collection is the body of international law prohibiting genocide, covert warfare, destabilization of countries, propaganda war, and economic war, establishing that such violations of sovereignty are actually crimes against humanity.

These conventions essentially prove that human rights are the basis for rights of national sovereignty, and that attacks against sovereignty are violations of human rights.

Long-Form Reference	Short-Form Reference	In-Line Micro Reference	Link
Paris “Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide” of 1948	1948 “Convention on Crime of Genocide”	(1948 “Convention on Genocide”)	PDF
“Declaration on Principles of International Law Concerning Friendly Relations and Cooperation Among States” of 1970	1970 “Declaration on Law of Cooperation of States”	(1970 “Law of Cooperation of States”)	PDF
“Principles of International Cooperation in the Detection Arrest Extradition and Punishment of Persons Guilty of War Crimes and Crimes Against Humanity” of 1973	1973 “Principles of Crimes Against Humanity”	(1973 “Crimes Against Humanity”)	PDF

New York “Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States” of 1974	1974 “Charter of Economic Rights & Duties of States”	(1974 “Economic Rights of States”)	PDF
“Declaration on the Inadmissibility of Intervention and Interference in the Internal Affairs of States” of 1981	1981 “Declaration on Interference in Internal Affairs of States”	(1981 “Internal Affairs of States”)	PDF
“International Convention Against the Recruitment Use Financing and Training of Mercenaries” of 1989	1989 “Convention Against the Use of Mercenaries”	(1989 “Convention on Mercenaries”)	PDF
World Summit Outcome on “Responsibility to Protect” of 2005 [Security Council]	2005 World Summit “Responsibility to Protect”	(2005 “Responsibility to Protect”)	PDF
UN Security Council Resolution “Protection of Civilians in Armed Conflict” of 2006	2006 UN-SC “Protection of Civilians in Armed Conflict”	(2006 UN-SC “Protection of Civilians”)	PDF

Law Protecting Diplomatic Status

This is the core body of international law requiring the respect and protection of diplomatic status, which prohibits states from violating diplomatic privileges and immunities in furtherance of committing violations of human rights and other international law.

These conventions also substantially define and prove the official powers and authorities of non-territorial states, such as sovereign historical institutions and inter-governmental organizations (IGO’s).

Long-Form Reference	Short-Form Reference	In-Line Micro Reference	Link
“Charter of the United Nations” of 1945	1945 “United Nations Charter”	(“UN Charter”)	PDF
UN Resolution 377 “Uniting for Peace” of 1950 [Security Council Override]	1950 UN Resolution “Uniting for Peace”	(1950 UN “Uniting for Peace”)	PDF
Vienna “Convention on Diplomatic Relations” of 1961	1961 “Convention on Diplomatic Relations”	(1961 “Diplomatic Relations”)	PDF
Vienna “Convention on Consular Relations” of 1963	1963 “Convention on Consular Relations”	(1963 “Consular Relations”)	PDF
New York “Convention on Special Missions” of 1969	1969 “Convention on Special Missions”	(1969 “Special Missions”)	PDF
Vienna “Convention on the Law of Treaties” of 1969	1969 “Convention on Law of Treaties”	(1969 “Law of Treaties”)	PDF
International Court of Justice “Congo v. Belgium” Judgment of 2002 [Diplomatic Immunity]	2002 ICJ “Congo v. Belgium” Judgment	(2002 ICJ “Congo v. Belgium”)	PDF
New York “Convention on Jurisdictional Immunities of States and Their Property” of 2004	2004 “Convention on Jurisdictional Immunities of States”	(2004 “Immunities of States”)	PDF

Law Empowering Judiciary & Legal Professions

This collection is the body of fundamental international law requiring the respect and protection of Judiciary status, the absolute independence of the Judiciary, and privileges and immunities of Judges, prosecutors and lawyers.

These prohibit government officials from interfering in the independent role of lawyers and Courts in furtherance of committing violations of human rights and other international law. Several key human rights related to Justice and due process of law are included within these conventions.

Long-Form Reference	Short-Form Reference	In-Line Micro Reference	Link
New York "Convention on the Recognition and Enforcement of Foreign Arbitral Awards" of 1958	1958 "Convention on Enforcement of Foreign Arbitral Awards"	(1958 "Enforcement of Foreign Awards")	PDF
New York "Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of Crimes Against Internationally Protected Persons" of 1973	1973 "Convention on Internationally Protected Persons"	(1973 "Internationally Protected Persons")	PDF
"Declaration of Basic Principles of Justice for Victims of Crime and Abuse of Power" of 1985	1985 "Declaration of Justice for Crime & Abuse of Power"	(1985 "Justice for Crime & Abuse of Power")	PDF
Milan "Basic Principles on the Independence of the Judiciary" of 1985	1985 "Principles on Independence of Judiciary"	(1985 "Independence of Judiciary")	PDF
Havana "Basic Principles on the Role of Lawyers" of 1990	1990 "Principles on Role of Lawyers"	(1990 "Role of Lawyers")	PDF
Havana "Guidelines on the Role of Prosecutors" of 1990	1990 "Guidelines on Role of Prosecutors"	(1990 "Role of Prosecutors")	PDF

“Basic Principles and Guidelines on the Right to a Remedy and Reparation for Victims of Gross Violations of International Human Rights Law” of 2005	2005 “Principles on Right to Remedy for Human Rights Violations”	(2005 “Right to Remedy for Human Rights”)	PDF
New York “Declaration on the Rule of Law at the National and International Levels” of 2012	2012 “Declaration on Rule of Law at International Levels”	(2012 “Declaration on Rule of Law”)	PDF
Hague “Convention on the Recognition and Enforcement of Foreign Judgments in Civil or Commercial Matters” of 2019	2019 “Convention on Enforcement of Foreign Judgments”	(2019 “Enforcement of Foreign Judgments”)	PDF

Non-Aligned Movement (NAM) Declarations

This is a collection of the most important Declarations of the Non-Aligned Movement (NAM), an inter-governmental alliance of 120 Member States supported by 17 Observer States (consisting of 71% of the UN General Assembly).

These Declarations are ratified at NAM Summits of Heads of State every three years, recognizing principles and rules of international law, thus comprising a supplementary body of conventional international law.

The NAM, originally founded for developing countries to deal with the Cold War, adapted its modern focus to directly dealing with the problem of Globalism as a threat to Nationalism. These are the essential Declarations proving the original NAM founding principles, and the continuing forward directions of the alliance.

Long-Form Reference	Short-Form Reference	In-Line Micro Reference	Link
Bandung “Asian-African Conference” of 1955 [Founding Principles]	1955 NAM “Bandung Asian-African Conference	1955 NAM “Bandung Conference”	PDF
Belgrade “Declaration of the 1 st Summit of Heads of State of the Non-Aligned Movement” of 1961	1961 NAM “Belgrade Declaration of 1 st Summit”	1961 NAM “1 st Summit Declaration”	PDF
Kuala Lumpur “Declaration of the 13 th Summit of Heads of State of the Non-Aligned Movement” of 2003	2003 NAM “Kuala Lumpur Declaration of 13 th Summit”	2003 NAM “13 th Summit Declaration”	PDF
Havana “Declaration of the 14 th Summit of Heads of State of the Non-Aligned Movement” of 2006	2006 NAM “Havana Declaration of 14 th Summit”	2006 NAM “14 th Summit Declaration”	PDF
Margarita “Declaration of the 17 th Summit of Heads of State of the Non-Aligned Movement” of 2016	2016 NAM “Margarita Declaration of 17 th Summit”	2016 NAM “17 th Summit Declaration”	PDF

Customary Law & Common Law Sources

This is a collection of a few authoritative sources, which reliably prove the existence and definition of doctrines of customary law, to establish rights of Common Law.

It is necessary to prove legal principles and rights from these antique editions, which strictly applied full scholarship to preserve detailed knowledge, before such reference books were progressively edited to suppress such knowledge after ca. 1915.

Long-Form Reference	Short-Form Reference	In-Line Micro Reference	Link
United Kingdom “Crown Office Act” of 1877 [Sovereign Decrees]	1877 United Kingdom “Crown Office Act”	(1877 UK “Crown Office Act”)	PDF
Henry Campbell Black, “Black’s Law Dictionary” (1891), 2 nd Edition, West Publishing Co. (1910)	“Black’s Law Dictionary” (2 nd Ed.) 1910	(“Black’s Law” 2 nd 1910)	PDF
John Bouvier, “Bouvier’s Law Dictionary and Concise Encyclopedia” (1839), 3 rd Revision, West Publishing Co. (1914), Volume 1 (A-E)	“Bouvier’s Law Dictionary” (3 rd Rev.) 1914, Vol.1	(“Bouvier’s Law” 3 rd 1914, V.1)	PDF
John Bouvier, “Bouvier’s Law Dictionary and Concise Encyclopedia” (1839), 3 rd Revision, West Publishing Co. (1914), Volume 2 (F-M)	“Bouvier’s Law Dictionary” (3 rd Rev.) 1914, Vol.2	(“Bouvier’s Law” 3 rd 1914, V.2)	PDF
John Bouvier, “Bouvier’s Law Dictionary and Concise Encyclopedia” (1839), 3 rd Revision, West Publishing Co. (1914), Volume 3 (N-Z)	“Bouvier’s Law Dictionary” (3 rd Rev.) 1914, Vol. 3	(“Bouvier’s Law” 3 rd 1914, V.3)	PDF