

**Saint-Petersburg Resolution on the  
anti-family trends in the United Nations,  
on the unacceptable actions of the United Nations human rights treaty monitoring bodies  
and on the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child  
on a communications procedure**

*Approved at the Public Hearing  
On November 24th, 2011  
Saint-Petersburg, Russian Federation*

We, being the representatives of the civil society and non-governmental organizations of the Russian Federation and Ukraine, taking part in the second hearing conducted in Saint-Petersburg on November 24<sup>th</sup>, 2011, addressing the influence of international political organizations on the condition and welfare of the family in our countries, have examined the current trends concerning family problems in the United Nations, and in particular some activities of the UN treaty monitoring bodies, including the Committee on the Rights of the Child. We have also given special attention to tendencies towards imparting binding legal force to the interpretations and recommendations of the UN treaties monitoring bodies<sup>1</sup> and to the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on a communications procedure<sup>2</sup>, which is to be adopted shortly by the UN General Assembly.

Considering the above-mentioned subjects in the context of multiple international tendencies, affecting the life, status, and welfare of the natural (traditional) family in our countries, we do declare the following:

1. We are strongly convinced that the natural (traditional) family, inscribed in human nature, and based on the voluntary union of a man and a woman in a lifelong covenant of marriage, intended for the birth and upbringing of children, is “the natural and fundamental group unit of society” (Art. 16 (3) of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights).

---

<sup>1</sup> See, e.g. Pretoria Statement on the Strengthening and Reform of the UN Human Rights Treaty Body System, 20-21 June 2011, <http://www2.ohchr.org/english/bodies/HRTD/docs/PretoriaStatement.doc>

<sup>2</sup> UN Document A/C.3/66/L.66

It is obvious to us, that the authoritative and binding international human rights instruments, such as the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (Art. 16) and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (Art 23.1 and 23.2), speak of the family, understood in this natural and traditional way. This is evident from the language used in these documents.

The place of the family in the history and in the life of every human society is absolutely unique, and no other form of domestic relationship can be regarded as having equal status and value. Any attempt to provide the equal status to any other form of domestic relationship, particularly to same-sex unions, is socially destructive.

Therefore we are convinced that the tendency to substitute the invented and disputable term “the family in all its forms” (implying the inclusion of different forms of same-sex partnerships) for “the family” in the recent UN documents is unfounded, hazardous and leads to anti-family implications.

2. We are convinced that the natural family, marriage, and the birth and rearing of children are inseparably linked to each other. Artificial separation of the birth and rearing of children from the natural family, family life, and marriage violates the genuine rights of the child and leads to the destruction of any society.

3. We are convinced that children have a natural right to be born into their natural (traditional) family, with a married man and woman, and to live with and be raised by their parents, that is with their natural mother and father. Mothers and fathers are the model of life for their children, especially of family life, which conforms to human nature.

4. We willingly agree with the position of the Constitutional Court of the Russian Federation, that “the family, and maternity and childhood, understood in the traditional sense, received from ancestors, are the values that provide the uninterrupted alternation of generations, and are the necessary condition for the preservation and development of the multinational people of the Rus-

sian Federation, and therefore they are in need of the special defense.”<sup>3</sup> We believe that this is true for every people in the world.

5. We are seriously concerned about the actions of some international organizations, in recent years, acting contrary to the interests of sovereign peoples and manipulating the notion of “human rights,” to artificially create so-called rights that were previously unknown and had no foundation in human nature and in the nature of society, such as “the right to an abortion” and “the right to choose sexual orientation and gender identity.” In reality there exist no such rights under international law, either by way of treaty obligation or under customary international law.

Moreover we are strongly convinced that any international obligation or any provision under national law that are destructing of and threatening to the family as “the natural and fundamental group unit of society”, should be regarded as illegitimate, because they contradict human nature and genuine natural human rights.

6. We are seriously concerned about the activities of some relatively small but well funded groups which have designated their own ideals as representative of the whole civil society, while their interests contradict the genuine interests of sovereign peoples. The natural (traditional) family, the preservation of its rights and privileges (including parental rights), and the defense of traditional family values are in the center of the genuine interests of every people.

7. It causes serious concern that, when trying to attain their destructive aims, these groups seek to use the resources of authoritative international organizations, such as the United Nations and its specialized agencies and organizations (WHO, UNICEF, UNFPA et al.). Using opaque and far from genuinely democratic procedures, and masking their true designs with eloquent words, they attempt to induce authoritative international organizations to approve documents, strategies and

---

<sup>3</sup> The Determination of the Constitutional Court of the Russian Federation of 19.01.2010 N 151-O-O

programs that worsen the condition of the natural family in various states, leading to the family's (and by extension the states') gradual destruction.

8. In particular, we have great concern over the fact that today, under the pretexts of defending children's rights under an unreasonably broad interpretation, and some recently forged new "human rights" (such as "sexual rights"), with the support of the UN and its bodies, the traditional culture of family life (which includes rearing children in that context) is being systematically destroyed for many peoples, including peoples of our Countries.

We have to regard it as a form of ideological violence, violating the right of our sovereign peoples to preserve its cultural identity and its traditions of family life and child-rearing. Some international organizations and agencies are manipulating the human rights concepts in order to justify the violation of the natural rights of parents and family, and in order to compel the sovereign governments to change their national laws preserving the parental rights and the legitimate autonomy of family in favor of so called "new global ethics" and "new global values".

Besides the fact, that it is not a development nor a "sustainability", but rather a destruction of the society, we regard this as an unacceptable form of new colonialism, obliterating the sovereignty and cultures of nations. It is the family with its natural rights that is a source and foundation of true freedom of peoples of the world. Therefore destruction of the natural family inevitably leads to the enslavement of peoples.

9. We insist that states should respect the unique role and position that natural (biological) parents have in the lives of their children. Any interpretations of any provision under the international or national law should reflect the natural presumption that natural parents usually act in good faith and in the best interests of their children. The rights of the parents in respect to their children are natural and not "given" to the parents by the state or any national or international

authority. Therefore no government or any other authority (including international ones) can legitimately cross the natural boundaries of parental and family rights in their regulations.

We are strongly concerned over the existing unfounded and hazardous interpretation of Article 3 of the Convention of the Rights of the Child, regarding the government as having authority to control and supervise the life of any family and the decisions of any parent under the pretext of providing “the best interests of the child”.

We are convinced that the natural (biological) parents of the child in most cases have the best understanding of the genuine interests of their children. The genuine children’s rights and interests, as a fundamental rule, are best protected in the context of their natural family, especially by their parents, or representatives chosen and appointed by the parents. Therefore it’s the parents and not the government, experts or international authorities have the natural right to determine “the best interest of the child”.

We are disturbed by the practice of some states, intervening into family life under the pretext of providing “the best interest of the child,” revising the reasonable decisions of parents, and imposing their own decisions instead. This problem is widespread in the fields of child rearing, health care, and education, and it should be regarded as a violation of natural and genuine human rights and family rights. This tendency clearly contradicts the genuine interests of children.

10. This problem is especially dramatic in the field of education. Despite the prior right of the parent to choose the kind of education that shall be given to their children, proclaimed in the Article 26(3) of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the governments are forcing families into state-imposed kinds and forms of education. The religious, moral and pedagogical convictions of the parents are often not respected, as well as their liberty to ensure the religious and moral education of their children in conformity with their own convictions, provided under Article 13.3 of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights.

Notwithstanding that the liberty of parents to direct the upbringing and education of their children is the natural right of the parent, it is too often overridden by the state without any genuine and solid foundation. In fact, we regard it as the abuse of the state power when the children's right to education is misused to diminish the spiritual, moral and educational influence of their family and indoctrinate them with values, ideas and practices alien to the convictions of their parents.

We are convinced that this tendency is socially destructive and undermines the very foundations of human society.

11. We also have great concern over the failure to protect the right of the unborn children to life under the pretext of the invented women's "right to an abortion". We are well aware that "[a]s a matter of scientific fact a new human life begins at conception" and "[f]rom conception each unborn child is by nature a human being"<sup>4</sup>. Unborn children are human beings, and therefore there exists an obligation of states under international law to defend their lives equally with that of any other human being. At the same time "[t]here exists no right to abortion under international law, either by way of treaty obligation or under customary international law"<sup>5</sup>.

12. In this context we are alarmed at the facts concerning some activities of UN treaty monitoring bodies, especially the Committee on the rights of the Child (CRC Committee) and the Committee on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW Committee).

«Treaty monitoring bodies have no authority, either under the treaties that created them or under general international law, to interpret these treaties in ways that create new state obligations or that alter the substance of the treaties.

---

<sup>4</sup> San-Jose Articles, Art. 1 and 3, [http://www.sanjosearticles.com/?page\\_id=2](http://www.sanjosearticles.com/?page_id=2)

<sup>5</sup> San-Jose Articles, Art. 5.

Accordingly, any such body that interprets a treaty to include a right to abortion acts beyond its authority and contrary to its mandate. Such *ultra vires* acts do not create any legal obligations for states parties to the treaty, nor should states accept them as contributing to the formation of new customary international law»<sup>6</sup>.

At the same time, the CEDAW Committee and the CRC Committee more than once acted *ultra vires*, trying to create new state obligations in their interpretations of the treaties, or interfering with the national sovereignty.

It is well known that the CEDAW Committee «has read a right to abortion into the treaty and has pressed more than 90 countries to liberalize their abortion laws»<sup>7</sup>.

Some acts of the CRC Committee are even more evidently *ultra vires*.

For instance, the CRC Committee has read an obligation of the state-parties to eliminate all forms of corporal punishment of children (broadly interpreted) into the treaty it monitors<sup>8</sup>. This interpretation, irrespective of any attitude to the corporal punishment of children, was unfounded, did not follow from the language of the treaty and contradicted general rules of international treaty interpretation. In fact it led to the unfounded intervention of states in an area where

---

<sup>6</sup> San-Jose Articles, Art. 6

<sup>7</sup> San-Jose Articles, note to Art. 6

<sup>8</sup> CRC General Comment No. 8 (2006) - The right of the child to protection from corporal punishment and other cruel or degrading forms of punishment (arts. 19; 28, para. 2; and 37, inter alia) (CRC/C/GC/8), n. 18: "Corporal punishment and other cruel or degrading forms of punishment are forms of violence and States must take all appropriate legislative, administrative, social and educational measures to eliminate them". This was done despite the open recognition by the Committee that this obligation was not presumed by the state-parties: "Article 19 and article 28, paragraph 2, do not refer explicitly to corporal punishment. The *travaux préparatoires* for the Convention do not record any discussion of corporal punishment during the drafting sessions" (ibid. n. 20). Inventing this new obligation the CRC Committee does not take into consideration that this interpretation contradicts one of the general rules of interpretation of treaties, provided under Art. 31.1 and 31.2(b) of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties («A treaty shall be interpreted in good faith in accordance with the ordinary meaning to be given to the terms of the treaty in their context .... The context for the purpose of the interpretation of a treaty shall comprise, in addition to the text, including its preamble and annexes ... any instrument which was made by one or more parties in connection with the conclusion of the treaty and accepted by the other parties as an instrument related to the treaty»). The Republic of Singapore made the following declaration upon accession to the Convention on the Rights of the Child: «The Republic of Singapore considers that articles 19 and 37 of the Convention do not prohibit ... the judicious application of corporal punishment in the best interest of the child». No objections were made to this declaration by the State Parties.

the freedom and autonomy of family and parental decisions was rightfully recognized by most of the states. Irrespective of any attitude to the corporal punishment of children it promoted an ideology in which the constant state control over the parents and family is regarded as normal and acceptable practice, while in reality it contradicts both natural human and family rights and the natural presumption that the parents are deciding and acting in the best interests of their children.

Likewise the CRC Committee and CEDAW Committee read into the treaties they monitor the obligation of the states to provide the mandatory sex education for children, regardless of their family's and parents' opinion<sup>9</sup>. This interpretation is unfounded and directly contradicts Article 5 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child. At the same time UN agencies like WHO are offering regional "standards" of sexual education starting from the moment of birth that include instruction of children on invented "sexual rights" having no foundation in human rights treaties. Those "standards" include providing children with information, the sharing of which with child-

---

<sup>9</sup> See, e.g., CRC/C/IRL/CO/2 Para. 52, CRC/C/KOR/CO/3-4 Para. 58, CEDAW/C/CRI/CO/5-6 Para. 27 (a), CEDAW/C/2002/1/CRP.3/Add.7 Para. 112 and many others.



ren is prohibited and rightfully criminally prosecuted in some countries as the corruption of minors<sup>10</sup>.

In its General Comment No. 13 (2011), CRC Committee directly intrudes into the area of national sovereignty, demanding from the state-parties to «Ratify the two Optional Protocols to the Convention, and other international and regional human rights instruments that provide protection for children ...» and to «Review and withdraw declarations and reservations contrary to the object and purpose of the Convention ...»<sup>11</sup>. The same General Comment requires from the state to change national legislation in line with the CRC Committee's interpretations of the Convention provisions, to “Establish and support an independent national institution of children's rights” and to fund all the measures recommended by the Committee<sup>12</sup>. These obligations evidently do not follow from the treaty, monitored by the CRC Committee.

We regard those actions and interpretations of UN treaty monitoring bodies as unacceptable and undermining the genuine basics of the international law.

---

<sup>10</sup> See, e.g. Standards for Sexuality Education in Europe: A framework for policy makers, educational and health authorities and specialists, WHO Regional Office for Europe and BZgA, Cologne 2010 (<http://www.bzga-whocc.de/pdf.php?id=061a863a0fdf28218e4fe9e1b3f463b3>). The document states (p. 12): “In this document, it was deliberately decided to call for an approach in which sexuality education starts from birth”. Then it states (p. 31) that “[s]exuality education is based on a (sexual and reproductive) human rights approach”, despite the fact that the notion of “sexual rights” is absent in generally recognized binding international treaties. Document demands to provide children at the age of 0-4 (p. 38) with the information about “enjoyment and pleasure when touching one's own body, early childhood masturbation”. It demands to provide children at the age of 9-12 (p. 45) with information about “sexual rights, as defined by IPPF and by WAS”. The note refers to the following documents: International Planned Parenthood Federation (IPPF): Sexual Rights: an IPPF declaration. London 2008 and World Association for Sexual Health (WAS): Declaration of Sexual Rights. Hongkong 1999. IPPF declaration (<http://www.ippfwhr.org/sites/default/files/files/SexualRightsIPPFdeclaration.pdf>), among other points, states in Principle 4 (p. 14) that “[s]exuality, and pleasure deriving from it, is a central aspect of being human, whether or not a person chooses to reproduce”. WAS declaration ([http://www2.huberlin.de/sexology/ECE5/was\\_declaration\\_of\\_sexual\\_righ.html](http://www2.huberlin.de/sexology/ECE5/was_declaration_of_sexual_righ.html)) gives the following definition of “the right to sexual pleasure” (at 5): “The right to sexual pleasure. Sexual pleasure, including autoeroticism, is a source of physical, psychological, intellectual and spiritual well being”. In the context of the Russian culture, for example, this sort of “sexual education” for children at the age of 9-12 could be rightfully regarded as criminally prosecuted corruption of minors. Art. 135 part 3 of the Criminal Code of Russian Federation provides the punishment of 5 to 12 years of imprisonment for committing lecherous actions with a child under the age of 12. As commentators point out, these actions could be of physical as well as of intellectual (cynical talks etc.) character. See, inter alia: Commentary on the Criminal Code of the Russian Federation, ed. by V. Tomin and V. Sverchlov, 6<sup>th</sup> ed., Moscow, 2010, p. 445.

<sup>11</sup> UN Document CRC/C/GC/13, n. 41

<sup>12</sup> Ibid.

13. As we noted above, there is a real possibility of interpreting some of the provisions of the Convention on the Rights of the Child and other UN human rights treaties wrongly, in a hazardous way that is unfavorable for the family and its rights, and therefore is socially destructive and contradicts the genuine interests of all sovereign peoples.

We are firmly convinced, that in this situation the very existence of some important examples of *ultra vires* acts by the UN treaty monitoring bodies, makes it dangerous for the true welfare of society and for the future of sovereign peoples to provide those bodies with any additional power, especially with the authority to provide any interpretations and decisions that would be legally binding for the state parties.

Therefore, as representatives of civil society, we strongly object to any attempts to attach any legally binding force to the interpretations of the UN human rights treaties given by the UN treaty monitoring bodies.

14. Evaluating the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on a communications procedure in this context, we believe that the procedures it proposes would be used not only to defend the genuine rights of the children, but also to impose dubious and socially dangerous interpretations of the Convention on the state parties. Unfortunately, taking into account the above mentioned precedents, we cannot have enough confidence in the CRC Committee at present.

Therefore, in the current uneasy situation, we regard it as unwise, unreasonable and even unsafe to provide the CRC Committee with any kind of quasi-judicial authority, even if not formally binding.

15. We declare and proclaim our strong conviction that all UN human rights treaties must be interpreted in a way favorable to the natural family and natural parental rights. They also must be

interpreted as defending the natural right of unborn children to life from the moment of conception.

All interpretations contradicting this approach must be rejected, as contrary to natural human rights, even if given by an authoritative body. If any provision under any international treaty or other international human rights instrument cannot be interpreted in compliance with this principle, such a provision must be amended or such an instrument must be denounced *in toto* as inhuman.

If any international organization or agency insists on any principle or norm contrary to this approach, this policy should be openly identified by the governments as socially destructive. In such a case, the governments, acting for the good of their peoples and mankind, should either compel such an organization to recognize natural human rights, natural family rights and natural parental rights or to leave such an organization or agency.

16. We, representing the interests of civil society of our countries and our nations' families, exhort our national authorities, as well as all international organizations, including the United Nations and its bodies and agencies, to stand up consistently for the interests of the natural family, which is the foundation of every society.

We exhort the UN General Assembly to abstain from the adoption of the new Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child for the time being, until the policies of the UN treaty monitoring bodies are adjusted in accordance with the above stated principles and approaches.

If adopted without such an adjustment, we exhort the governments of our countries as well as the other national governments not to sign and not to ratify this Optional Protocol.

We also declare that we will not tolerate any action by any representative of any international organization that could be regarded as destructive to the traditional culture of our countries, in-

cluding our traditions of family life and child-rearing. If such actions are not stopped, it will raise substantial questions before the wide public of our countries concerning the suitability of our countries' continued membership in such an organization. We are strongly convinced that our sovereign peoples' membership in any authoritative organization is less significant than preserving the foundation of our societies – the natural (traditional) family and our cultural identity.

**This Resolution was also approved by the following NGOs and Civil Society Representatives:**

**The Russian Federation**

1. Interregional Public Organization “For Family Rights” (Pavel Parfentiev)
2. Public Organization “Anapa Fathers’ Council” (Maxim Tsymbal)
3. City Cossack’s Society of Arkhangelsk (Ataman’s deputy for Public Relations, Yan Lagutenko)
4. Organization of Altai Krai "Association of the orthodox teachers of Altai Krai " (Antonina Shelankova)
5. Regional Public Organization «Association of Professional Midwives» (Moscow, Yulia Labaturina)
6. Charitable Foundation for the Defence of Childhood (Mineralnye Vody, Yuriy Lazin)
7. Khanty-Mansi Regional Public organization for the creative, social and spiritual development of women “Veda” (Nyagan, Lyudmila Zayneeva)
8. World Congress of Families – Representative in the Russian Federation (Alexey Komov)
9. Saint-Petersburg Regional Branch of All-Russian Public Movement “All-Russian Woman’s Union – The Hope of Russia” (Tamara Alexandrova)
10. Chelyabinsk Regional Branch of All-Russian Public Movement “All-Russian Woman’s Union – The Hope of Russia” (Galina Marina)
11. All-Russian Public Movement “All-Russian Parents’ Gathering” –Regional Branch of Moscow (Laarisa Pavlova)
12. All-Russian Public Movement “All-Russian Parents’ Gathering” –Regional Branch of Moscow Oblast (Galina Bazanova)

13. Altai Krai Regional Branch of the Public Movement “Civil Initiative for the Free Advanced Education” (Sergey Vasilyev)
14. IPD “Movement for the Resistance to the murdering of Children” (Moscow, Sergey Khvesyuk)
15. Altai Krai Public Organization for Guardians, Orphan Children, and Children who Lost their Parents “Kind Heart” (Lilia Novikova)
16. Tula Regional Branch of All-Russian Public Organization “For Life and Defence of Family Values” (Ekaterina Kisteneva)
17. Editorial board of the News Agency “Patriot of Pomorye” (Alexye Mihaylov)
18. Autonomous Noncommercial Organization “Informational human rights conflictological center “Arkaim” (Olga Burankova)
19. Charitable Foundation for the Defence of Motherhood and Life “Kolybel” (Khanty-Mansi Autonomous Area, Pokachi, Nelli Panasyuk)
20. Cossacks’ Brotherhood in the name of the Exaltation of the Cross (Saint-Petersburg, Petr Laktionov)
21. Interregional Public Movement in Defence of Parents’ and Children’s Rights “Interregional Parents’ Gathering” – Altai Regional Branch (Olga Filatova)
22. Leningrad Oblast branch of the Interregional Public Movement for the defence of parents’ and children’s rights “Interregional Parents Gathering” (Evgenia Kirillova)
23. Interregional Public Movement in Defence of Parents’ and Children’s Rights “Interregional Parents’ Gathering” – Saint-Petersburg Regional Branch (Larisa Kocheryzhnikova)
24. Altai Krai Public Movement “Many Children – it is good” (Elena Kochubenko)
25. “Moscow Parents” Public Movement (Galina Schneider)
26. Municipal Parents Committee for all Schools (Anapa, Sergey Khokhlov)
27. Regional Public Organization for Assistance and Help for Mothers of Large Families Facing Social Problems “Nadezhda” (Khanty-Mansi Autonomous Area, Nyagan, Olga Murasova)
28. Arkhangelsk Regional Branch of the Interregional Public Movement “People’s Council” (Alexander Tutov)
29. Arkhangelsk Regional Branch of the Interregional Public Organization “National Council for Social Information” (Tatyana Dryagina)
30. Saint-Petersburg Cossacks’ Association “Nevskaya Stanitsa” (Sergey Poyedinenko)

31. City Public Organization “City Parents’ Committee of Nyagan” (Khanty-Mansi Autonomous Area, Nyagan, Claudia Elovskih)
32. Public Committee in Defence of Family, Childhood and Morality of Sarov city in Nizhny Novgorod Oblast (Nadezhda Tarasova)
33. Public Organization of Altai Krai “Parents’ Public Committee” (Olga Sinyavina)
34. Public Center of Legal Expertise and Legislative Activity (Moscow, Elena Timoshina, Candidate of Law)
35. Altai Branch of the Society of Orthodox Physicians (Elena Kharchenko)
36. Regional Public Organization “United Parents’ Committee of Moscow Oblast” (Ruslan Tkachenko)
37. Local Public Organization “Podolsk City Parents’ Committee” (Igor Sikhotin)
38. The Orthodox Medical and Educational Center “Zhizn” in Saint-Petersburg (Elena Lee)
39. International Association “Roditeli-Planety.RF” (Evgeniy Khranovskiy)
40. Regional Public Organization for the Natural Birth and the Conscious Parenthood “Rozhdenie” (Moscow Oblast, Eugenia Lomonosova)
41. Altai Krai Public Organization Committee for the rights of the Child “Fialka” (Lilia Vladimirova)
42. Local Public Organization “Obninsk City Parents’ Committee” (Kaluga Region, Obninsk, Natalia Brik)
43. Regional Public Organization “United Parents’ Committee of Kaluga Oblast” (Julia Markarova)
44. Khanty-Mansi Autonomous Area Regional Public Organization «Customers’ Rights Protection” “CUSTOMER” (Vladimir Didenko)
45. Civil Freedoms Support Foundation “Legal Mission”, “School for men called up for military service” (Chelyabinsk, Valeria Prikhodkina)
46. Interregional Public Movement for the support of the Orthodox Educational and Social Initiatives “Pchyolki” (Nikolay Bondarenko, Sub-editor of the “Man and Law” Magazine)
47. Working Group in the Moscow City Duma for the defence of families and children from juvenile technologies (Nikolai Mishustin)
48. Noncommercial Partnership in Defence of Family, Childhood, Person and Health “Parents’ Committee” (Tatyana Lemish)

49. Noncommercial Partnership in Defence of Family, Childhood, Person and Health “Parents’ Committee” – Representative in Saint-Petersburg (Lyubov Kachesova)
50. Noncommercial Partnership in Defence of Family, Childhood, Person and Health “Parents’ Committee” – Representative in Balashikha city of Moscow Oblast (Anna Zhuravleva)
51. Parents’ Committee of the Church of St. Right. Simeon of Verkhoturys (rev. Igor Kholmashikh)
52. Public Organization “Parents’ Gathering of Tula Oblast” (Svetlana Bozhenova)
53. Civil Coalition in Defence of Russian Child-Rearing and Educational Traditions “Roditel’skoye Stoyaniye” (Saint-Petersburg, Vasilii Kukhar)
54. Public Movement “Orthodox-Patriotic Front of Russia” (Alexander Ryzhkov)
55. Association “Russia. Family. Children” (Marina Ozhegova)
56. Chelyabinsk Regional Public Organization “Russian Cultural Center” (Petr Akimov)
57. Saint-Petersburg City Parents’ Committee (Mikhail Bogdanov)
58. Public Organization of Cossacks’ of Russia Union of Severodvinsk Oblast (Yuriy Grigoryev)
59. Sisterhood in the name of the Tikhvin icon of the Mother of God (Saint-Petersburg, Alla Sergiyenko)
60. Public Organization for Large Families of Severodvinsk City “Sem’ Ya” (Natalia Koroleva)
61. All-Russian Public Organization “Community of Large and Adoptive Families of Russia “Many Children is good!” (Tatyana Borovikova)
62. Orthodox Lawyers Union (Olga Yakovleva, Member of Moscow bar association, Honorable Attorney of Russia)
63. Regional Sporting and Patriotic Public Organization “Rus” (Sergey Bazhenov)
64. Public Organization of Magnitogorsk City “Trezvy Magnitogorsk” (Oleg Bakirov)
65. Public Organization “Trezvy Nizhnevartovsk” (Nizhnevartovsk, Nikolai Komarov)
66. Galina Chumakova, Professor, Head of a Chair of Perinatology and Neonatology of the Northern State Medical University (Arkhangelsk)
67. Regional Charitable Public Organization “Center for the Parental Culture “Svetlitsa” (Saint-Petersburg, Olga Lukoyanova)
68. Public organization «Center of Family Culture» Nizhnevartovsk District (Sergey Pindyurin)

69. Center of Social Programms. “Zhizn” Branch (Saint-Petersburg, Valentina Yatmanova)
70. Tatiana Shishova, Educator, Writer, member of the Member of the Union of Writers,  
Member of the Board of the Russian Children's Foundation
71. Ecological and Legal Center “Right for Life” (Eleonora Grish’enko)

***And The Association of Parents’ Committees and Unions, including:***

72. The Public Institute of the Demographic Safety (Irina Medvedeva, Member of the Board  
of the Russian Children's Foundation)
73. Municipal Parents’ Committee of Krasnoarmeysk (Chelyabinsk Oblast, Zhanna Krovoro-  
tova)
74. Tyumen City Parents’ Committee (Alexey Medvedev)
75. Parents’ Committee of Stavropol Krai (Evgeny Dukhin)
76. Chelyabinsk Provincial Parents’ Committee (Tatiana Kosheleva)
77. Parents’ Committee of Northeastern Autonomous District of Moscow (Alexander Ash-  
kov)
78. Public Movement “In Defence of Orphan Children, who Lost their Parents” (Olga Letko-  
va)
79. Moscow City Parents’ Committee (Tatiana Novoselova)
80. IPM “Parent’s Committee of North Caucasian Federal District” (Kira Moiseeva)
81. Public Movement “Parents’ Committee of Anapa” (Krasnodar Territory, Lyubov Yat-  
zukhno)
82. Spiritual and Educational Center in the name of priest-martyr Vladimir Ambartsumov  
(Vy Rev. Alexander Ilyashenko, Member of the Union of Writers, Chairman of the Edi-  
torial Board of “Pravoslaviye I Mir” Media-Portal)
83. Parents’ Internet-Committee (Moscow oblast, Olga Anokhina)
84. All-Russian Public Organization “For Life and for the Defence of Family Values” –  
Bashkiria Branch (Vy Rev. Vyacheslav Arkhangelskiy)
85. Public Center in Defence of Family and Childhood of Tatarstan “TTP Feniks” (Sergey  
Ivanov)
86. Alexandrovsk Parents’ Committee (Raphail Garaphsin)
87. Parents Committee of “Preobrazheniye” School (Anapa, Faina Nedikova)
88. Parents Committee of the Nursery School № 80 (Naberezhnye Chelny, Elena Krupnina)



89. Center for the Development of Parents' Volunteering (Alexander Chernavskiy)
90. Internet Community "Committee of the Concerned Parents" (Penza, Elena Ishmayeva)
91. Regional Public Movement "Parents in Defence of Family and Childhood" in Khanty-Mansi Autonomous Okrug-Yugra (Maria Fedotova)
92. Voronezh City Parents' Committee (Mikhail Shmelev)
93. Regional Parents' Organization (Committee) "Happy Childhood in Native Family" (Yekaterinburg, rev. Oleg Vokhmyanin)
94. Samara City Parents' Committee (Boris Kotzenko)
95. Regional Public Organization "Parents' Committee of Yugra" (Khanty-Mansiysk, Svetlana Polivanova)
96. Parents' Committee of Mineralnye Vody District of Stavropol Krai (Peter Goldin)
97. Movement in Defence of Childhood – Nizhny Novgorod Regional Branch (Sergey Pchelintsev)
98. Internet-Community "Against Foresight Project "Childhood 2030" and Juvenile Justice" (Ekaterina Vanchikova)
99. City Parents' Committee of Vyatskiye Polyany (rev. Boris Babushkin)
100. Tver Regional Branch of the Interregional Public Movement in Defence of Parents' and Children's Rights "Interregional Parents' Gathering" (Tver, Mikhail Tsvetkov)

## **Ukraine**

101. Crimean Orthodox Medical and Educational Center "Zhizn" (Simferopol, Oleg Ignatiev)
102. Public Organization "The Healthy Nation" (Dnepopetrovsk, Iohanna Kerestin')
103. Odessa Regional Public Organization "Cadets' Union" (Angelina Gaidarova)
104. Public Organization "New Village" (Simferopol, Sergey Goraychuk)
105. Public Organization "Odessa City Council of the Large Families" (Odessa, A. Artemenko)
106. Charitable Foundation "Podderzhka" (Ilyichevsk city of Odessa Oblast, Valery Viktorov)
107. Public Organization "Orthodox Parents' Committee" (Volnogorsk, Lyubov Gargulya)
108. Public Organization "Orthodox Parents' Committee" (Dnepopetrovsk, Gennadiy Lavrentiev)

109. Public Organization “Orthodox Parents’ Committee” (Zhitomir, Dmitry Bezrukov)
110. Public Organization “Preodoleniye” (Ilyichevsk city of Odessa Oblast, Lyudmila Simakova)
111. Orthodox Family Tourist Club “Put” (Odessa, Maria Maximova)
112. Public Organization “Parents of Odessa Region for Children” (Dmitry Turnov)
113. Public Organization “Parents’ Committee” (Kharkiv, Alexander Kanevsky)
114. Public Organization “Parents’ Committee of Nikolayev” (Nikolayev, Anton Polovenko)
115. Public Organization “Parents’ Committee of Lugansk Region” (Severodonetsk, Elena Shulga)
116. All-Ukrainian Public Organization “Parents’ Committee of Ukraine” (Kiyiv, Evgenia Ugro)
117. Charitable Organization “Salvation of the Nation” (Simferopol, Viktor Kryuchkov)
118. Public Organization “Sporting and Health-Improving Club “Oasis” (Kiyiv, Galina Kosmina)
119. Youth Public Organization “Tochka Opory” (Simferopol, Kirill Khristnko)
120. Public Organization “Trezvaya Svyataya Rus” (Alchevsk, Valeriy Kodachenko)
121. Public Organization “Farvater” (Odessa, Irina Maximova)
122. Youth Public Organization “Zlata Lada” Foundation” (Odessa Oblast, Elena Nikolaenko)
123. Public Organization “Christian Ukraine” (Lviv, Miroslav Danilkov)
124. Public Organization “Christian Orthodox Spiritual Center” (Ilyichevsk city of Odessa Oblast, Alexey Chuiko)
125. Charitable Foundation “School Planet” (Kiyiv Oblast, Natalia Marchenko)
126. Charitable Organization "Family Center “You and Me” (Simferopol, Elena Marchulina)