

10 Reasons to Abolish the UN

By Daniel Greenfield



HUMAN RIGHTS COUNCIL

Copyright 2010
David Horowitz Freedom Center
PO BOX 55089
Sherman Oaks, CA 91499-1964
Elizabeth@horowitzfreedomcenter.org

www.frontpagemag.com
ISBN: 1-886442-82-7
Printed in the United States

\$3.00 Each
\$1.00 each for orders of 25 or more

10 Reasons to Abolish the UN

The most hateful event of the year will take place under United Nations auspices in the city with the second largest Jewish population in the world.

Soon after the anniversary of the massacre of three thousand Americans a decade ago, the United Nations General Assembly will consider recognizing a Palestinian state. Even though the Gaza half of that proposed state has a charter calling for the destruction of Israel and the genocide of the Jewish people.

Events that unfold this September will be a reminder that the United Nations is not only a biased organization, but that it is a conspiracy of tyrants and terrorists. Their obsessive war against the free world has become its war as well.

The 65th General Assembly session had 16

resolutions targeting Israel. Burma, Iran and North Korea were hit with one each. The United Nations Relief and Works Agency is dedicated to aiding the Palestinians with half of that money going through the hands of the terror group Hamas. But whether it's the UNRWA or WHO or UNESCO, the Human Rights Council or the International Labor Organization, the Commission on the Status of Women or the International Court of Justice; there is only one real item on the agenda: Israel.

The Isaiah Wall opposite the United Nations carries a quote from Isaiah, but a more appropriate quote would be from Ecclesiastes. "That which is crooked cannot be made straight."

The United Nations was crooked from its very beginning. Its spine was bent, its morals were bent and its purpose was bent. The tyrants and terrorists of the world have bent it to their will.

June 26, 1945

Sixty-six years ago the representatives of 50 nations met and signed the treaty that created the United Nations. The Republic of China, the first nation to sign, exists now only as an isolated

chain of islands, abandoned by its former allies and shut out at the UN.¹ The nation that has taken its seat is the People's Republic of China, a Communist dictatorship responsible for the deaths of 40 million of its own people.

The UN's treatment of the first signatory to its charter is representative of how the politicization of its laws and the degradation of its principles have undermined the founding ideals of this organization.

UN Resolution 2758 mandated the expulsion of the Republic of China "for the protection of the Charter of the United Nations and for the cause that the United Nations must serve under the Charter."^{2*} The nation that put forward this resolution replacing a founding member with a Communist dictatorship was the Socialist People's Republic of Albania, another Communist dictatorship, which kept its own labor camps and tortured political prisoners, and whose economy was heavily subsidized by the People's Republic of China.

The resolution barred the first signatory to the UN Charter from ever reapplying for membership

¹ <http://treaties.un.org/doc/Publication/CTC/uncharter.pdf>

² <http://www.taiwandocuments.org/un2758-XXVI.htm>

in the international organization - officially in the name of protecting the UN Charter, but actually in the name of protecting the territorial ambitions of the People's Republic of China and the political alliance of Communist nations.

The USSR, the second signatory, was already responsible for the murder of tens of millions through its program of ethnic cleansing and mass repression. Its signature on the Charter did not alter its policies. Its gulags did not close as a result; its armies did not pull back from captive nations.

A number of the 50 original signatories were already on the verge of being made satellites of the Soviet Empire. The 51st, Poland, was delayed from joining the 50 by a Soviet-backed Communist takeover. Even as the ink was drying on a charter of world peace, the second signatory to that charter was forging the chains that would bind a tenth of the other signatories into a totalitarian empire.

In the two months after the UN treaty signing in San Francisco, the signatories would issue new declarations of war, drop nuclear weapons and fight civil wars. It was a reminder that very little had changed or would change: that for all the

idealistic sentiments of its Charter, the UN was an affirmation of the status quo. The wars and genocides and the selective UN interventions that would follow would dramatically bear this out.

Democracy of Tyrants

The Preamble to the United Nations Charter states that it was created to “to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war”, promote fundamental human rights, the equality of women and economic and social progress.

Sixty-six years later, the United Nations has not only failed to champion these ideals, it is actively destroying them – under the guise of tolerance, idealism, multiculturalism and peace.

The United States and the United Nations are both democracies. While the United States of America is a republic of free citizens, the United Nations is a democracy of tyrants.

Every tyranny is equally represented at the UN. Every king, dictator, sheikh, colonel, prince, beloved leader and president-for-life has a seat at the table. And since there are twice as many

tyrannical states as there are full democracies, simple majority rule always favors tyranny.

Given a choice between the global democracy of tyrants and law, justice and human rights, the UN stands on the side of tyranny. Its membership may accede to the removal of a single tyrant, but only with the approval of the global democracy of tyrants.

It is the United States and some of its allies who have served as the conscience of the United Nations, who have defended the Charter and its ideals from the UN's own membership. But as America goes on leveraging its Security Council position, its diplomatic and economic influence in a losing battle against the corrupt membership of a corrupt organization – the question must be asked, why does it need to participate in an organization dominated by dictatorships at all?

The 51 founding members of the UN were roughly balanced between democracies and dictatorships. As the United Nations membership expanded, the ratio of tyrannies to democracies increased.³ According to the *Economist's* Demo-

³ <http://www.un.org/depts/dhl/unms/founders.shtml>

cracy Index, there are 26 full democracies and 55 authoritarian regimes with the latter outnumbering the former in population 3 to 1.⁴ The average UN representative is statistically less likely to be speaking for a democratically elected government and far more likely to be there as the personal representative of a tyrant or an oligarchy.

The United Nations is for war and genocide when its influential members are for it. It is for tyranny when its members are tyrants. It is for the oppression of women when enough of its members belong to a religion that believes women are inferior to men.

The ideals on which the United Nations was built have failed miserably. Its conventions have not averted invasions and atrocities. All they have done is provided a fig leaf for them to hide behind. The world's worst tyrants have signed conventions on human rights and ignored them; the world's most oppressive nations have chaired the UN Human Rights Council.

No law or code can be upheld by a system of hypocrisy. The hypocrite's law is always relative.

⁴ http://graphics.eiu.com/PDF/Democracy_Index_2010_web.pdf

In a kingdom of thieves, only the bandit who steals from the wrong thief gets his hands cut off. That is the state of international law today. It is not the breaking or the keeping of the law that matters. All that matters is not running afoul of the powers and factions that dominate the United Nations.

There are so many reasons to abolish this organization that is difficult to choose only ten.

1. The United Nations Obstructs America's Defense of the Free World

There was a time when it was thought that war would destroy mankind unless an international consensus arose to restrain it. In 1928, the World Peace Act attempted to outlaw war. Eleven years later, half the signatories to the WPA were at war with each other.

Most of the UN's 51 Founding Members were engaged in a war against Japan when they signed the Charter on June 26, 1945. Soon afterwards, half the Founding Members were engaged in a Cold War with each other.

Within a mere two years, three of the founding

members were engaged in civil wars. Over the next decade millions more would die in new conflicts. And the list of genocides would continue to steadily grow adding up to some 50 million dead on the UN's watch.

The UN was unsurprisingly just as hapless in the face of war as its predecessor, the League of Nations. But its emphasis on pacifist multilateralism also made it more difficult for individual states to prevent war and genocide.

If the sole determining factor for intervention was international law, then wars and genocides would be treated equally regardless of the identities and alliances of the parties involved. But the United Nations operates under the umbrella of political interests which prioritize alliances over atrocities. Only when a consensus among the democracy of tyrants is reached can any meaningful action be taken.

Nations are still able to invade with impunity, occupy, colonize and engage in genocidal civil wars, if they have enough friends among the membership and an ally on the Security Council. Rwanda was a member of the Security Council

during its genocide. But its membership was only temporary. Some aggressor states like Russia are permanent members. And this, along with internal politicking that puts Tammany to shame, allows them to do anything they want domestically or internationally without fear of UN condemnation.

“We are quiet, not afraid. Send the news to the world and say it should condemn the Russians. The fighting is very close now and we haven’t enough guns. What is the United Nations doing? Give us a little help. We will hold out to our last drop of blood.”

That was the last telex out of Hungary during the invasion of 1956. And no help came.

The Soviet Union blocked a resolution in the Security Council and the Hungarian freedom fighters who expected decisive UN intervention were left to spill that last drop or flee across the border. Afterward, a report by the Special Committee on the Problem of Hungary documented every atrocity and war crime. And the General Assembly passed a resolution “deploring” Soviet actions.

When the USSR invaded Afghanistan, it successfully blocked a resolution of condemnation in the Security Council. Instead the General Assembly voted on a resolution that “strongly deplored” the armed invasion, without even naming the state responsible.

The United Nations then oversaw the Geneva Accords, which helped put the country into the hands of the Taliban. Its failure was crystallized in a single scene when Taliban thugs took the former President Najibullah out of the UN compound where he had taken sanctuary, castrated him and dragged him behind a truck. It was not the first or the last time such a thing would happen at a compound under the blue flag. And it was an apt metaphor for the UN’s helplessness.

The People’s Republic of China has engaged in war, occupation, genocide and ethnic cleansing without consequences. It bullies smaller nations in the South China Sea secure in the knowledge that the UN will do nothing to oppose it. A precedent for appeasement was set after the Battle of the Paracel Islands when South Vietnam’s appeals to the United Nations fell on deaf ears, blocked by China’s seat on the Security Council.

The United Nations cannot restrain aggression by a lawless and powerful member state or compel it to follow international law. Only the United States can maintain the rights of small nations against the tyranny of great powers, in Eastern Europe or the South China Sea. And whether taking a stand against the Taliban in Afghanistan or a Cuban backed takeover in Grenada – it has also shown it has the resources and the will to intervene against smaller, but no less homicidal groups. But unlike totalitarian states and terrorist groups, the United States can be successfully obstructed by the United Nations.

In 2010, United Nations peacekeeping operations were budgeted at 7.83 billion. Over half the funds for those operations came from NATO members.⁵ A quarter of was contributed by the United States. Essentially the only useful part of the UN's peacekeeping program is NATO—an admission that the United States and its allies remain the only force capable of stopping major armed aggression.

The United Nations is not only itself helpless in the face of war, but often committed to obstructing

⁵ <http://www.un.org/en/peacekeeping/operations/financing.shtml>

the United States. By doing this it encourages aggressors to use it as a tool to protect themselves from American intervention.

The first clause of the Preamble of the United Nations Charter proclaims its intention “To save succeeding generations from the scourge of war.” But the organization has become an echo of Chamberlain rather than of Churchill. The lessons of the dangers of appeasement, learned in the bloody wake of the war leading to its creation, have been muffled inside its chambers.

Sixty-six years after the Charter was signed during the dying days of a war that shook the world, the United States is still the only force capable of saving the world. And its idealistic creation, the United Nations, has become the obstacle, allowing lives to be lost through inaction and armed aggression to prosper through its political cowardice.

2. The United Nations is a Force of Global Injustice

The United Nations has only called ten emergency sessions. Five of them have targeted

Israel. In 1967, the UN and its Emergency Force made no effort to stop a planned genocidal invasion of Israel, but once it beat back the Arab aggressors, the UN did dedicate an emergency special session to criticisms and condemnations of it.⁶

No emergency session was called over Indonesia's invasion of East Timor and the resulting genocide there.⁷ The deaths of up to 200,000 people were not considered an emergency at the UN. However Israel's Golan Heights law, which applied Israeli law to territory that it had held for 15 years, occasioned yet another emergency session⁸.

While the resolution dealing with the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan two years earlier had not even named the state responsible, the Ninth Emergency Special Session resolution named Israel, and declared that it is "not a peace loving member state".

ES-9/1 denounced Israel, calling for an arms boycott and a suspension of cultural exchange and

⁶ http://www.un.org/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=A/6798&Lang=E

⁷ http://www.yale.edu/gsp/east_timor/unverdict.html

⁸ http://www.un.org/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=A/RES/ES-9/1&Lang=E

technological cooperation, demanding that all member states “cease...all dealings with Israel in order to totally isolate in all fields.”

No such language was ever used against the Soviet Union. During the Sixth Emergency Special Session dealing with the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan, the USSR was the world’s largest occupier of nations. It was guilty of genocide, mass political repression and a host of other crimes. But there was no call to drum it out of the community of nations.

ES-9/1 did not come in response to a war or even a single fatality, but a technicality involving two legal codes. Even if this was deemed to be absolutely and totally wrong, how could it have been more wrong than the genocide of nearly a fifth of a million people through starvation?⁹

What was the Security Council response to the Indonesian invasion of East Timor? A hollow resolution, which did not actively condemn it, but only called upon the Indonesian government to

⁹ http://www.yale.edu/gsp/east_timor/unverdict.html

withdraw its forces.¹⁰ A call that it did not heed.

While numerous resolutions have been adopted condemning Israeli “territorial violations,” the Arab-Muslim invasion of Israel in the 1973 Yom Kippur War did not merit any similar condemnations, only a non-judgmental call for a ceasefire.

Similarly Resolution 353 dealing with the Turkish invasion of Cyprus deplored the “outbreak of violence”, but did not directly criticize Turkey or name it as an aggressor. When Turkish Cypriots killed a UN peacekeeper, the UN passed another resolution namelessly deploring the incident. It took a total of six resolutions until it adopted Resolution 360 which formally disapproved of the unilateral actions against the Republic of Cyprus. The resolution still did not name the party responsible.

The declaration of the so-called Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus did not occasion anything like the reaction to Israel’s Golan Law. Even though Turkey had defied resolution after

¹⁰ <http://www.unhcr.org/refworld/category,LEGAL,,,TMP,3b00f1710,0.html>

resolution, and the carving up of Cyprus was now fact, Resolution 367 only expressed “regret”.

Who presided over the 1981 UN General Assembly session at which a total boycott of Israel was called for? Ismat Kittani, the Undersecretary for Foreign Affairs of Saddam Hussein. And while he was overseeing a vicious condemnation of Israel over a legal technicality—Kittani’s own country had invaded Iran, beginning the 20th century’s longest conventional war and one of its bloodiest.

Despite a death toll of around half a million, there was no emergency special session held over that. Instead Saddam’s man was allowed to preside over an assembly that castigated Israel as not “peace loving,” while serving a regime that employed nerve gas on the battlefield.

UN Security Council resolutions 612 and 620, which did address the use of chemical weapons, did not name Iraq as the guilty party and did not call for its global isolation, nor did they declare that it was not a “peace loving” member.

The United Nation’s obsession with Israel has been extensively documented, yet a session in

which a servant of Saddam and the protégé of a Nazi war criminal, Kurt Waldheim, declared that Israel was unfit to be a member of the community of nations, was more than a scene of memorable ugliness. It was a reminder of what the organization is and what it is not.

The United Nations has closed its eyes to invasions, tolerated genocide and accepted injustice. Where there is tyranny it is timid, but where there is freedom it is vicious. It knows no law but power, and it knows no justice but accommodation with a totalitarian majority. In the past this majority was assembled by the USSR and its vassal states. Today the totalitarian majority answers to the dictates of the Organization of the Islamic Conference.

It is not Eleanor Roosevelt's house. It is Stalin's house, Saddam's chamber, Ahmadinejad's rallying point and the sanctuary of those who aid such figures and conceal their crimes. Whether it's in Durban, Geneva, Vienna, Rome or New York City – the United Nations is a force for global injustice. And the presence of the United States, and every free nation, only lends moral credibility to its crimes.

3. The UN Obstructs the Prevention of Genocide

The United Nations adopted the Convention for the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide in 1948. And even before its adoption, the USSR had already rendered it meaningless by stripping away any mention of political genocide, thereby escaping the Convention's eventual censure.

While the USSR and Communist China could dodge charges of genocide, *We Charge Genocide*, an effort led by Communist musician Paul Robeson, accused the United States of genocide for discriminating against African-Americans.

The final wording meant that the Convention could apply to any mass death of a population—regardless of whether there was a deliberate intent to commit genocide, and even if the deaths were the unintended byproduct of a war.

The language engineered by the USSR meant that the bomb dropped on Hiroshima or the wartime bombing of Dresden by the British could be considered genocide. Widespread death and destruction affecting a single group would become

proof of genocide. And that devalued the concept. If every major nation was guilty of genocide, then no one was guilty of genocide.

And in fact, under the definitions of Article 2 of the Convention, almost every major country could be charged with one of the punishable acts enumerated in Article 3. The United States alone could be charged a dozen times over.

The vague wording of the Convention meant that almost any war could lead to charges of genocide being leveled against the victorious party. Typical of United Nations conventions, it was open enough that it could be used as a weapon of lawfare, with definitions so broad that everyone was in violation, and all violations were to be ignored, unless enough members formed a caucus to decide otherwise. Such legal codes are typical of totalitarian states where laws serve as a pretext for indictments against political undesirables, not as an actual universal code of conduct.

That same function is served by the UN's conventions.

How effective is the United Nations at tackling

genocide? When it happens or is about to happen, its peacekeeping forces usually find a good reason to be somewhere else. And the Security Council and General Assembly find some pressing Israeli matter to concentrate on.

Thirty years ago, the Khmer Rouge Communist Party carried out one of the bloodiest reigns of terror in the second half of the 20th century, causing the deaths of millions.

During the Cambodian Genocide, the UN Security Council did not issue a single resolution on it. While millions were dying, the UN occupied itself with condemning the Israeli expulsion of the Sharia judge of Hebron¹¹ and the United States for allowing former members of the Rhodesian government to enter the country¹².

It was not UN action but the Vietnamese invasion that finally put an end to the worst of the Pol Pot's terror. The United Nations, after being approached by the Cambodian government nearly two decades later, finally got down to the task of trying some of those involved for genocide.

¹¹ United Nations Security Council Resolution 484

¹² United Nations Security Council Resolution 437

That was 1997. An agreement to conduct the actual trials was signed six years later. Another three years after that, actual judges were finally approved to preside over the tribunal. It had taken nine years just to get to this point.

In 2007, the first indictment was issued against Pol Pot's second in command. Nuon Chea had been 70 when the UN was first approached. He was now almost 80. Today he is 84 and the trial is still going on.¹³ The odds are very good that he will die before it is all over.

So far the only man convicted of anything in the proceedings, whose origins date back to the 90's and have budgets in the hundreds of millions of dollars, is Kaing Guek Eav, who ran the Tuol Sleng prison.¹⁴

The Khmer Rouge Tribunal could hardly have sent a louder message about UN impotence in the face of genocide. Even when there was no risk and the defendants were long out of power, their trial would be little more than a forum for its officials to prattle about justice and law, while

¹³ <http://www.nytimes.com/2011/06/28/world/asia/28cambodia.html>

¹⁴ <http://frontpagemag.com/2011/07/08/the-belated-khmer-rouge-trials/2/>

practicing both as little as possible.

Nor can it be said that the Khmer Rouge Tribunal is exceptionally incompetent. The International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia has been going on for 18 years. Slobodan Milosevic, its key defendant, died after being on trial for 5 years. (Possibly of boredom.) So did 16 other defendants. It might be reasonable to conclude that any court where defendants die of natural causes before a verdict is rendered owes a little too much to Kafka.

The International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda has been going on for 17 years. In 1998, Resolution 1165 urged “the organs of the International Tribunal for Rwanda actively to continue their efforts to increase further the efficiency of the work of the International Tribunal in their respective areas” and mentioned “an exceptional measure to enable the third Trial Chamber to begin to function at the earliest possible date.”¹⁵

Seven years later, citing a long string of previous resolutions, Resolution 1503, recalled and reaffirmed “in the strongest terms” a deadline to end all investi-

¹⁵ <http://www.un.org/ictt/english/Resolutions/1165e.htm>

gations in 2004, to end all activities at first instance in 2008 and to shut down by 2010.¹⁶ It's 2011 and the tribunal is still going strong. The latest deadline is 2014, twenty years after the actual genocide took place.

After 17 years, only 38 convictions have been completed with no appeal. That isn't even 2 convictions per year. 19 more cases are still pending appeal. 8 were acquitted. 10 cases are still going on.¹⁷

The International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda has had 25 judges and only 92 defendants over the course of 17 years. That's not even four defendants to a judge for a caseload stretching over nearly two decades. This may make the Tribunal the least efficient justice system in all of human history.

The biennial budget for the tribunal is around 250 million dollars with nearly 700 posts.¹⁸ (This is actually a reduction, as there used to be well over

¹⁶ <http://daccess-dds-ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N03/481/70/PDF/N0348170.pdf?>

¹⁷ <http://www.unictr.org/Cases/StatusofCases/tabid/204/Default.aspx>

¹⁸ <http://www.unictr.org/AboutICTR/GeneralInformation/tabid/101/Default.aspx>

a 1000 posts.) The total cost of the whole affair has long ago run into the billions. In 2005, some 15 million dollars alone was spent on the defense teams. There are entire countries with a smaller judicial budget than that. Half of Africa could have been fed with the money spent on the tribunal.

And even the convictions are often farcical. Vincent Rutaganira was charged on eight counts, including genocide, extermination and murder.¹⁹ He pleaded guilty to one count of a Crime against Humanity, Extermination as an Accomplice by Omission. After three years of assorted hearings, it was decided that due to his “good behavior” and “advanced age of 60” – that he should be released in three years time.

And he was.

If such a short sentence for Crimes against Humanity from a billion dollar genocide tribunal was not ridiculous enough, the case notes make it clear that Vincent should probably never have been tried at all. Rather than being tried for perpetrating genocide, he was charged with failing to prevent

¹⁹ http://www1.umn.edu/humanrts/instate/ICTR/RUTAGANIRA_ICTR-95-1C/RUTAGANIRA_ICTR-95-1C-T.pdf

it. A number of Tutsi survivors however testified that he had saved their lives, given them shelter and false identity cards.

The tribunal had arrested the Hutu version of Oskar Schindler and dragged him through the system and imprisoned him on what basis? For failing to prevent the massacres. And what was he supposed to have done? According to the judgment, “the Chamber finds that the Accused had the power to convene a meeting of the inhabitants of the secteur to initiate and conduct discussions on the tragic events that were taking place in his secteur, in order to prevent participation in the massacres that occurred at the church, at least, by civilians.”

With the conclusion being that, “Vincent Rutaganira’s intervention saved some people who had been targeted by attackers. It can be inferred from such a finding that a similar intervention by the Accused against some civilians who participated in the attacks on Mubuga church would have had the same decisive effect in sparing human lives.” Vincent’s very attempts to save lives were used to indict him for not averting larger massacres.

Yet if a failure to prevent genocide is a cause

for indictment, then why has the entire UN not been indicted?

An independent inquiry into the UN's actions in Rwanda, which included a former prime minister of Sweden and a former foreign minister of South Korea, among others, found that, "The Failure by the United Nations to prevent, and subsequently, to stop the genocide in Rwanda was a failure by the United Nations system as a whole."²⁰

Kofi Annan's statement on the report admitted that despite the Convention for the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide, "the United Nations and its Members States – failed to honour that obligation". He further admitted that "there was a United Nations force in the country at the time, but it was neither mandated nor equipped for the kind of forceful action which would have been needed to prevent or halt the genocide".²¹

Could such a forceful action have been taken while Rwanda sat on the UN Security Council? The UN withdrew the majority of UNAMIR during

²⁰ <http://www.un.org/pubs/cyberschoolbus/briefing/peacekeeping/pkfocus.htm>

²¹ http://www.un.org/News/ossg/sgsm_rwanda.htm

the genocide and the Security Council's resolution omitted the term genocide.

Resolution 929 called for a “political settlement” and authorized only a “strictly humanitarian” operation to be conducted “in an impartial and neutral fashion” that would “not constitute an interposition force between the parties.”²² Naturally no one would want to interpose a force in an ongoing genocide.

UN Peacekeepers have stood by during massacres in Rwanda and Sudan.²³ They have watched mass rapes in the Congo. They have seen atrocity after atrocity, and used them to raise more funds for their own bureaucracy.

4. The UN Distorts Women's Rights to Promote Violence against Women

In 2010, the UN rolled four unwieldy organizations – Division for the Advancement of Women (DAW); International Research and Training Institute for the Advancement of Women

²² <http://www.unhcr.org/refworld/docid/3b00f15c50.html>

²³ <http://www.independent.co.uk/news/world/africa/un-accused-of-standing-by-while-sudanese-forces-killed-civilians-2308896.html>

(INSTRAW); Office of the Special Adviser on Gender Issues and Advancement of Women (OSAGI); and United Nations Development Fund for Women (UNIFEM) – into one – the United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women to be known as UN Women. Words and acronyms were moved around, but nothing else changed.

UN Women has a Facebook page, a Twitter account and a minimum annual \$500 million budget. It champions quotas and conventions. It praises countries which have ratified the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW) even though CEDAW countries such as Saudi Arabia, Pakistan and Afghanistan are actually far more repressive, than a non-CEDAW country like the United States.

The 2011 “Progress of the World’s Women – In Pursuit of Justice” report tells a story in which women everywhere are unequal, but constantly achieving equality.²⁴ This suggests that the struggle of women in England, Pakistan and Rwanda is the same. The selective use of quotas, metrics and convention signatures furthers the lie that the

²⁴ <http://progress.unwomen.org/pdfs/EN-Report-Progress.pdf>

treatment of women in the West and the Third World differ only in detail.

A woman born in South Africa has a better chance of being raped than learning how to read, but the report praises South Africa for setting up a Special Commission “to monitor the implementation of the gender equality provisions of their Constitutions.”

This love of special commissions and committees is endemic to the UN. Its bureaucracy savors 150 page reports, which, like Soviet Five Year Plans, give the illusion of forward motion by following rigid plans from the upper echelons. But the commissions are cold comfort to the one in four African women who have been raped.

The 2008 CEDAW report was critical of the UK because of an insufficiently high percentage of women in its parliament.²⁵ On the other hand “In Pursuit of Justice” praises Rwanda for its 30 percent quota for female legislators. Is Rwanda a better place for women than the UK because it has a quota?

²⁵ http://www.iwraw-ap.org/committee/pdf/41_concluding_observations/united_kingdom.pdf

According to these same metrics, the United States is even worse than the UK.²⁶ It ranks 70th in female legislative representation behind such notable champions of women's rights as Bangladesh (61) the United Arab Emirates (45) Iraq (36) and Afghanistan (30). In the lead are the rape capitals of the world, South Africa and Rwanda.

Is the United States really behind Afghanistan in women's rights? The Commission on the Status of Women includes such champions of women's rights as Iran, Haiti, Rwanda and Libya.²⁷ This composition reminds us of how little these commissions and committees have to do with women's lives.

The Commission on the Status of Women passed only one resolution condemning a specific country. That country was not Saudi Arabia, Iran, Ethiopia or Mali. It was Israel. The resolution of the 55th session was the usual boilerplate condemnation of Israel, with the words "women and girls" placed in the appropriate spots.²⁸

²⁶ <http://www.ipu.org/wmn-e/classif.htm>

²⁷ http://www.un.org/womenwatch/daw/csw/CSW56_Membership.pdf

²⁸ http://www.americanthinker.com/blog/2011/03/the_uns_commission_on_the_stat.html

Its first clause insisted that “the Israeli occupation remains the major obstacle for Palestinian women with regard to their advancement, self-reliance and integration in the development of their society,” an assertion that did not even pretend to acknowledge the existence of Hamas and its denial of women’s inheritance rights, morality police and posters that claim women wearing slacks is “Satanic”.²⁹

Of the other two resolutions passed in that session, one called for female empowerment in climate change policies. Again an existing UN agenda item that had nothing to do with women was being dressed up in the clothing of women’s rights. If the UN’s “Entities” are to be believed, then Rwanda and Afghanistan are leading the way in women’s rights. If the “Progress of the World’s Women” report is to be credited, it is necessary also to believe that Indonesia’s Sharia Islamic courts help women receive justice. And if you listen to the Commission on the Status of Women, then women are better off under Hamas’ rule, than under Israeli law.

²⁹ <http://www.un.org/womenwatch/daw/csw/csw55/other-outcomes/Palestinian-adv-unedit.pdf>

What the UN and its Three-Card Monte rights games do is shuffle around the truth about the status of women in the West, Africa and the Muslim world until no one can find it. And once that's done, they turn to their first love of launching attacks against First World countries where women enjoy far more rights than in the Muslim bloc whose agenda has come to dominate the UN despite its constant endemic violence against women.

The UN Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women has only three stories on Israel. All three of them are about the Palestinians. The existence of an Israeli female Chief Justice, female opposition leader and female parliament speaker do not register – except as oppressors of Palestinians.

One story features a photo collection of imprisoned female terrorists, including failed suicide bombers depicted in head coverings, side by side with sympathetic complaints about their treatment.³⁰

³⁰ <http://www.unwomen.org/2011/06/photo-exhibition-palestinian-female-prisoners/>

Half the UN Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women's booklets for 2011 are on the Palestinians.³¹ One of these is a Palestinian Authority National Gender Strategy Booklet harshly critical of Christianity for denying equality to women that hardly mentions Islam's impact on women's rights.³²

The cover of children's drawings features numerous women, almost every one of them wearing a Hijab. One full page drawing shows a boy stuck on an Israeli security fence. The only girl in the picture is off to the side. Despite looking all of 9 years old, she too is wearing a Hijab. Is it the fence or the Hijab that oppresses women?

Behind the reports and the 500 million dollar budgets, the true face of UN feminism involves misleading statistics, quota-based representation and 10 and 15 year programs of action that fund local NGO's who know how to write grant requests while avoiding making any waves at home.

The UN's "Entities" refuse to recognize that

³¹ <http://www.unwomen.org/resources/>

³² <http://www.unwomen.org/wp-content/uploads/2011/05/UN-Women-oPt-Booklet-Palestinian-Gender-Strategy-2011-en.pdf>

women's rights emerge out of a culture of equality, a notion that does not exist in Islam, and promote the spread of a doctrine that does not recognize women as equals to the free world. Without that recognition, no amount of advocacy, quotas and convention signatures will do anything but put a stamp of approval on a culture of repression.

That the most serious threat to women's rights in the world comes from Islamic law is a fundamental truth that an organization increasingly dominated by a Muslim bloc is incapable of addressing. The rise of Sharia courts in Europe, honor killings in America and gang rapes in Australia is fed by immigration from countries where women are not recognized as equals. But rather than combating the spread of discrimination and violence against women, the United Nations perpetuates it by promoting Islamic migration.

Oslo, which has hosted numerous UNIFEM and UN Women meetings, has a sexual assault rate six times as high as New York.³³ In 2010 *every single solved rape case* was found to have been

³³ <http://www.brusselsjournal.com/node/1754>

carried out by its mostly Muslim immigrants.³⁴ One woman recalled her rapist saying that his religion told him that he had the right to do anything he wanted to a woman. Women in Norway, who have been able to vote for over a century, are now losing the simple right to walk freely out of doors without being assaulted.

The UN's version of women's rights gives nothing and ends up taking away even the most basic rights that Western women have learned to take for granted. And it replaces them with the rights of Rwanda and Afghanistan.

5. The UN Cannot Prevent Nuclear Proliferation

The first resolution of the first General Assembly meeting dealt with the threat and promise of the atom. As is usual at the United Nations, the solution was a commission tasked with writing reports and making proposals. That commission was UNAEC, the United Nations Atomic Energy Commission.

Resolution 1 followed what would become a familiar track.³⁵ It urged the peaceful use of atomic

³⁴ <http://www.aina.org/news/20110629194229.htm>

³⁵ <http://www.un.org/documents/ga/res/1/ares1.htm>

energy, along with its regulation and inspection to ensure that it could only be used for peaceful purposes, and the elimination of atomic weapons at some future date. These would become two of the major planks in the modern NNPT or Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty.

It was the international regulation part that was the sticking point. The Report on the International Control of Atomic Energy proposed putting all fissile material under the control of an international body. But how could any international body overrule the two world powers behind it? This question would bedevil all efforts at international regulation.

The only global disarmament proposal that the USSR would accept was a toothless plan that it could veto through the Security Council. From the start, the United Nations' democracy of tyrannies had made any serious effort at global non-proliferation impossible and the nuclear arms race inevitable.

Truman's representative to UNAEC, Bernard Baruch thundered, "Let us not deceive ourselves;

we must elect world peace or world destruction.”³⁶ But the world did not actually have to choose between the two. Instead a stalemate of Mutually Assured Destruction kept both sides from pulling the trigger. UNAEC shut down not long after the failure of the Baruch Plan; the IAEA, the organization that would replace it, was the product of the next administration.

Eisenhower’s Atoms for Peace indirectly tackled disarmament, by bribing countries who were not yet members of the club with access to nuclear energy through an international nuclear agency to prevent them from building their own nuclear stockpiles.

The Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty turned that approach into an awkward treaty that allowed the members of the nuclear club to keep their weapons while barring everyone else from acquiring them. This approach was doomed from the start. The NNPT attempted to make the IAEA and Atoms for Peace relevant. But the nuclear club has continued to grow, and signatories to the treaty have still pursued covert nuclear weapons programs. Even the world’s largest nuclear proliferator, North

³⁶ <http://goo.gl/uYdgz>

Korea, was an NNPT signatory.

While the United Nations and associated organizations still talk of disarmament, it is clearer than ever that no nation that has ready to use nuclear weapons will voluntarily give them up. And that no treaty can successfully monopolize nuclear technology or prevent signatories from pursuing their own weapons programs.

The Conference on Disarmament is being presided over by North Korea, which has not only violated every nuclear pact and agreement it ever signed, but has made it clear that it has no intention of ever abiding by them. Canada is boycotting the Conference over North Korea's role, but the rest of the members, which include Iran and Pakistan, will be there.

So will the Obama Administration, whose State Department spokeswoman called it “a relatively low-level, inconsequential event.”³⁷ It's not entirely clear if she meant North Korea's presidency, or the Conference itself. But she would have been right either way. The Conference is irrelevant. So is every international effort aimed at those same

³⁷ <http://www.state.gov/r/pa/prs/dpb/2011/07/168018.htm>

goals.

In the 65th General Assembly session, a resolution was finally passed on “The Dangers of Proliferation in the Middle East.” The resolution did not mention Iran, but did attack Israel for not signing on to the NNPT. Even though there is no conceivable state in the region that Israel would pass on nuclear technology to.

North Korea and Libya engaged in nuclear weapons development after becoming signatories to the NNPT. Iran is a signatory, but is still developing a nuclear program. And the IAEA has actually helped its fanatical leaders cover up that program. The events of the last twenty years make it impossible to deny that the NNPT is a failure. And that the IAEA has become a weapon in the hands of nuclear proliferators who exploit its Third World sympathies to restrain American intervention.

6. The UN is an Undemocratic Perversion of Democracy

The United Nations’ Universal Declaration of Human Rights³⁸ states that “the will of the people

³⁸ <http://www.un.org/en/documents/udhr/>

shall be the basis of the authority of government.” But the UN’s own governance emerges from a democracy of tyrants. If the UN itself is not democratic, how can it promote democracy?

The UN has a fund, a commission, a committee or some other entity for nearly everything. So even though the majority of its members are not democracies, there is UNDEF, a democracy fund, on a mission to bring democracy to its own members. Because there is nothing that can’t be solved with a towering budget, a large staff and handouts to NGO’s.

Anyone who stops by the UN Visitors’ Lobby in July will find an exhibit of photographs on The Doers of Democracy.³⁹ There are no pictures of Americans, but there are photos of young Afghan girls in headscarves promoting the UNDEF’s funding of “My Rights, Our Rights, Others’ Rights in the Light of Islam,” a radio drama series that teaches lessons about human rights based on the Universal Islamic Declaration of Human Rights.⁴⁰

³⁹ <http://www.un.org/democracyfund/News/NFU09May11.html>

⁴⁰ http://www.un.org/democracyfund/XNewsHumanRights_Afghanistan.htm

The Universal Islamic Declaration of Human Rights comes from the Islamic Council of Europe, via UNESCO, and its more recent cousin, the Cairo Declaration on Human Rights in Islam. The latter does not mention democracy. Instead it states that the Islamic Ummah is meant “to fulfill the expectations from this community to guide all humanity which is confused because of different and conflicting beliefs and ideologies”.⁴¹

This mission statement neatly encapsulates the opposite of democracy and freedom in a supremacist declaration of Islamic Manifest Destiny with the assertion that it exists to rule over humanity and remove conflicting beliefs.

Article 1 of the Cairo Declaration begins with a rejection of the American Declaration of Independence and the UN’s own Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Human beings, it states “are united by their subordination to Allah.” Anyone who is not a Muslim is already in violation of the Declaration.

This vision of a slave theocracy is further developed with the statement that the pious are

⁴¹ <http://www1.umn.edu/humanrts/instate/cairodeclaration.html>

superior. From the very beginning, the Cairo Declaration denies human equality, and instead asserts the superiority of Muslims over non-Muslims.

Article 2 states that the right to life is contingent on Sharia. Article 19 that, “There shall be no crime or punishment except as provided for in the Shari’ah.” Article 22 rules out protection for speech that violates Sharia or “the dignity of Prophets”. Which makes freedom of speech and religion impossible

Should the UN Democracy Fund be funding the indoctrination of inequality? Why not when UNDEF is the arm of an undemocratic organization. Qatar, one of the seven largest donors to UNDEF, is not even a democracy. It’s an authoritarian regime. But if you don’t need to offer equal rights to women to be able to sit on a commission dedicated to that purpose, why should you need to be a democracy to sit on the UNDEF advisory board?

Or to preside over the 66th General Assembly session as His Excellency, Nassir Abdulaziz Al-Nasser of Qatar is preparing to do, with Iran and

Kuwait, among the Vice Presidents⁴².

The majority of its members are not true democracies. Therefore any form of democracy that the UN promotes will be democracy as defined by the majority of its tyrannies.

The gap between the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the Islamic declarations is the fracture between the United Nation's ideals and its reality. The ideals may invest "The will of the people" with the the authority of government, but the actuality is closer to the Cairo Declaration, where governments and people exist only to obey Sharia.

If the UN truly believed that "the will of the people shall be the basis of the authority of government," it would have limited full membership to states that follow this principle. Instead it remains in violation of its own Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

The United Nations avoids the question by defining democracy as a journey rather than a destination. The Secretary General's Guidance

⁴² <http://www.un.org/News/Press/docs//2011/ga11105.doc.htm>

Note on Democracy says that “democracy is a dynamic social and political system whose ideal functioning is never fully achieved”.⁴³ Like women’s rights, human rights and every ideal that the UN claims to cherish – democracy is turned into a nice idea that no one practices, but everyone must pay lip service to by ratifying UN conventions.

If democracy is defined by a government’s ability to unilaterally ratify UN conventions, then tyrannies which are less subject to internal debate will appear more democratic than the democracies. By setting the standards high and the requirements for compliance low, most of the world becomes subject to the “Equality of Inequalities”. Those who practice real democracy are condemned for refusing to accept the supremacy of UN human rights mandates. And that is how the UN and other international organizations make the actual practice of democracy into a crime.

And that is why Americans should not feel comfortable with the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Not when Article 29 provides an open ended loophole for shutting down almost any

⁴³ http://www.un.org/democracyfund/About_Us/UNSG%20Guidance%20Note%20on%20Democracy.pdf

and every civil right.⁴⁴

Article 29 (2) In the exercise of his rights and freedoms, everyone shall be subject only to such limitations as are determined by law solely for the purpose of securing due recognition and respect for the rights and freedoms of others and of meeting the just requirements of morality, public order and the general welfare in a democratic society.

Article 29 (3) These rights and freedoms may in no case be exercised contrary to the purposes and principles of the United Nations.

If the Islamic declarations make all rights subject to the approval of Sharia, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights subjugates them to itself. The myth of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights unravels in its final paragraphs. Human rights are defined solely in terms of the United Nations agenda.

Both the Islamic and the UN human rights code are shams, their actual content dependent on their internal whims. There are no rights in either declaration, except those which are granted at the

⁴⁴ <http://www.un.org/en/documents/udhr/>

discretion of Islamic clerics or UN officials.

7. The United Nations is Hopelessly Corrupt

The United Nations Convention against Corruption is one of the sillier conventions, even by its own standards. Signatories include the world's most relentlessly corrupt states, Russia and Zimbabwe. Since no Convention would suffice without also having a day to commemorate it, December 9th is the UN's International Anti-Corruption Day.

On the 7th International Anti-Corruption Day, Secretary General Ban Ki-moon stated that, "The vulnerable suffer first and worst" due to corruption.⁴⁵ The vulnerable do indeed suffer first and worst due to the UN's corruption. UN Peacekeepers in the Congo were supposed to protect women and girls from being raped. Instead there have been 150 allegations of sexual abuse by UN personnel.⁴⁶ The actual unreported number is likely far larger.

⁴⁵ <http://www.un.org/News/Press/docs/2009/sgsm12660.doc.htm>

⁴⁶ <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/articles/A15363-2004Nov26.html>

The same story repeated itself in Haiti, with Muslim Peacekeepers accused of rape. And in Liberia, in Sudan and Burundi. UN Peacekeepers have been criticized for not preventing rapes in troubled areas, but how can they prevent what they themselves do?

If that wasn't bad enough, UN Peacekeepers have even been blamed for spreading AIDS in Asia and Africa, forcing Security Council Resolution 1308 to indirectly address the problem.⁴⁷

But financial corruption is even more pervasive at the United Nations. Hardly a year goes by without another contract kickbacks scandal. The latest such scandal n mid-2011.⁴⁸ The more money pours into the UN, the worse the scandals get. But the granddaddy of them all was the 64 billion dollar Oil for Food program that was supposed to provide humanitarian aid to Iraqi civilians. Instead it lined the pockets of Saddam's henchmen and UN officials.

The head of the Oil for Food program is a

⁴⁷ <http://www.unhcr.org/refworld/docid/3b00efd10.html>

⁴⁸ <http://www.eyeontheun.org/articles-item.asp?a=7102&id=8962>

fugitive from justice and the UN has refused to release the internal audits of the program, but the corruption allegedly extended to the UN Secretary General. While Oil for Food was one of the more spectacular examples of UN corruption, it grew out of a culture of corruption where bribes and ethical violations are routine.

Vladimir Kuznetsov, head of the United Nations Committee for Administrative and Budgetary Issues, was charged with conspiracy to commit money laundering.

Carina Perelli, the Director of the United Nations Electoral Assistance Division, was removed for abuse of power.

Sanjaya Bahel, Chief of the Commodity Procurement Section, was convicted of accepting bribes in exchange for UN contracts.

Pino Arlacchi, the head of the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime, a subdivision of which was the UN's Global Programme against Corruption, was ordered to step down after

accusations of misconduct.⁴⁹ (Ironically the UNCJIN site still bears a quote from Arlacchi, “Corruption is a major social and economic issue and the world’s tolerance of it is fading fast.”⁵⁰)

Dileep Nair, the head of the UN’s Office of Internal Oversight Services, who investigated Arlacchi, was also hit with misconduct charges⁵¹. Nair claimed he was the victim of a smear campaign by the United Nations Staff Council. The UN Secretary General pardoned Nair and the Council claimed that Kofi Annan had whitewashed Nair’s actions⁵².

Samuel González-Ruiz resigned from the Office of Internal Oversight Services, charging that the UN does not abide by the Convention against Corruption and that its own investigative office engages in criminal activity and punishes whistleblowers.⁵³

The Director General of the UN’s intellectual

⁴⁹ <http://goo.gl/p4Csx>

⁵⁰ <http://www.uncjin.org/CICP/Folder/corr.htm>

⁵¹ <http://www.unis.unvienna.org/unis/pressrels/2005/sgsm9793.html>

⁵² <http://goo.gl/U6a77>

⁵³ <http://goo.gl/ISGID>

property agency used a false birth certificate to get a promotion.⁵⁴ Khamis Suedi, another official at the same agency was accused of taking a sizable payment from an associate of UN Secretary General Kofi Annan's son in exchange for a UN renovation contract⁵⁵.

And finally there is the UN Kenya office which resettled refugees in exchange for bribes. An ugly example of how UN corruption and greed perverts even its humanitarian missions.

The culture of corruption at the United Nations means that it is unrecoverable as an organization. The UN has taken on the corrupt character of the worst of its member states and further involvement with it diverts resources from those who need it the most. We can best help the weak and vulnerable by taking our aid programs out of the corrupt hands of the United Nations.

8. The UN is an Economic Drain on America

The United States funds almost a quarter of the

⁵⁴ <http://www.foxnews.com/projects/pdf/Idris.pdf>

⁵⁵ <http://www.nytimes.com/2005/04/16/international/europe/16nations.html>

UN's budget.⁵⁶ In 2009 that added up to \$6 billion dollars. In 2010 it shot up all the way to nearly \$7.7 billion dollars.

Much of that money does not go directly to the UN in one large payment; instead it's funneled innocuously through domestic departments and agencies.

In 2009, \$245 million dollars came through the Department of Agriculture.⁵⁷ In 2010, \$139 million passed through the Department of Health and Human Services and \$50 million through the Department of Labor.⁵⁸ Even the Postal Service and the US Holocaust Museum were used to funnel money to the UN.

And that money goes to surprising places. The United States funds a quarter of the International Atomic Energy Agency, which obstructed efforts to stop Iran's nuclear program. And the UNRWA, a billion dollar welfare program for Palestinians,

⁵⁶ <http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2010/08/us-funding-of-the-united-nations-reaches-all-time-high>

⁵⁷ http://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/omb/assets/legislative_reports/us_contributions_to_the_un_06112010.pdf

⁵⁸ http://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/omb/assets/legislative_reports/us_contributions_to_the_un_06062011.pdf

gets over a quarter of its funding from the United States, \$237 million.

Should we be spending \$2 million to monitor labor rights in the Nicaraguan clothing industry, or

\$233 million on UNIFIL, the useless peacekeeping force in Lebanon, which in over 40 years has yet to stop a single outbreak of violence, or \$75 million to renovate the UN headquarters?

While Congress had attempted to impose greater transparency and a lower assessment rate by cutting payments, the Obama Administration eagerly paid out \$1.2 billion. And despite the fact that it pays over a quarter of the organization's budget, the UN claims that the United States is still in arrears of \$736 million.

The growth of American contributions to the United Nations has accelerated in the 21st century, doubling in the last decade. If the present trend continues, by the end of this decade we could be paying \$15 billion annually to the UN and \$30 billion by 2030.

The UN's out of control spending, worse even

than the U.S. government's, means that something must be done quickly. The Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights' budget alone shot up from less than 60 million in 2000, to nearly 180 million in 2010.⁵⁹ A triple increase in only a decade.

There is only one way out, and that is all the way out. The UN has failed at all of its missions. There is nothing that it does well, that the United States could not do better and more cost-effectively.

The only way to stop the UN financial drain on the US budget is to turn off the lights over Turtle Bay.

9. The United Nations Endangers American Civil Liberties

The United States was in the top five countries targeted for Human Rights criticism by the UN in 2010.⁶⁰ That's more often than Kuwait, Nicaragua, South Africa and North Korea combined.

Even though the US is its largest donor, United Nations officials have never hesitated to interfere in

⁵⁹ <http://www.ohchr.org/EN/AboutUs/Pages/FundingBudget.aspx>

⁶⁰ <http://www.eyeontheun.org/facts.asp?1=1&p=40>

its domestic affairs. When UN High Commissioner for Human Rights Navi Pillay condemned Texas' execution of murderer Humberto Leal Ortega, he was continuing a pattern of OCHCR interference, criticism and unwanted directives.

The HRC's Report of the Special Rapporteur on Extrajudicial, Summary or Arbitrary Executions urged the United States to work harder on due process in death penalty cases, investigate deaths in immigrant detention facilities and end military commission trials for Guantánamo Bay terrorists.⁶¹

The Report of the Special Rapporteur on Violence Against Women conducted by Rashida Manjoo,⁶² a member of the Women Living Under Muslim Laws Network, criticized America for what she claimed was a lack of federal provisions for preventing violence against women.⁶³ This was a special moment: a member of a religion that offers specific guidelines for beating women was lecturing the United States on domestic violence

⁶¹ <http://www.unhcr.org/refworld/category,COI,UNHRC,,USA,4a3f54cd2,0.html>

⁶² http://ap.ohchr.org/documents/alldocs.aspx?doc_id=17220

⁶³ http://www.wisemuslimwomen.org/muslimwomen/bio/rashida_manjoo/

courtesy of the UN.

Another HRC report on American racism, conducted by Doudou Diène, from Muslim Senegal, suggested that Congress establish a bipartisan commission to evaluate progress in the fight against

racism, and pass legislation that links “the fight against racism to the construction of a democratic, egalitarian and interactive multiculturalism.”⁶⁴

Section F of Diène’s report focused on “Measures to prevent discrimination in the aftermath of the events of 11 September 2001” and criticized the National Special Entry-Exit Registration Program as discriminatory because of its focus on Muslim countries.

The HRC Special Rapporteur on housing called for more federal funding for low income housing and proposed expanding the definition of homelessness to include people living with their families.⁶⁵

The Committee on the Elimination of Racial

⁶⁴ http://ap.ohchr.org/documents/alldocs.aspx?doc_id=15620

⁶⁵ <http://www.ohchr.org/EN/Issues/Housing/Pages/CountryVisits.aspx>

Discrimination criticized the United States for profiling Muslims and urged it to practice affirmative action, regardless of voter referendums and judicial rulings opposing quotas.⁶⁶ It also proposed a definition of discrimination based on effect, not purpose. This would mean that a policy with any negative impact on minorities (such as the requirement of a high school diploma for employment) would be defined as racist, regardless of whether there was discriminatory intent.

There is hardly any aspect of domestic life that United Nations officials do not seek to control and their interference represents a direct attack on American civil liberties.

Americans must choose between the UN's version of human rights and that of the Constitution. The message from the United Nations has been that the two are not compatible.

10. The UN Holds Human Rights Hostage to its Double Standards

The United Nations Commission on Human Rights was born in sin, with Soviet apparatchiks on

⁶⁶ http://www.aclu.org/files/pdfs/humanrights/cerd_concluding_report.pdf

the commission and deeply involved in the shaping of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

Vladimir Koretsky, a Soviet representative to the Commission, described it as a fight against “the remnants of fascism” with “a Bill of Rights which would prevent the rebirth of fascist systems and fascist ideology.”

By that the Soviets did not mean Mussolini and Franco, they meant the United States of America. The Communist Third International defined “Fascism” as “the open, terroristic dictatorship of the most reactionary, the most chauvinistic, the most imperialistic elements of finance capitalism.” It wasn’t long before the Communist press was applying the term to America and the rest of the free world.

But while Stalin’s henchmen were weaponizing human rights, they were also exempting their own regime from any human rights challenges. The Soviet insertion of state-based language into the Declaration would have made it possible for its atrocities to meet the Declaration’s standards, on the grounds that they were committed for the “the corresponding requirements of the democratic state.”

The Soviet effort to amend the Declaration so that human rights devolved to states rather than people failed, but so did a Belgian amendment to add democratic rights for different political parties.

By the 60's and 70's, the Commission had become a tool of Soviet lawfare. At its dismal conclusion in the 21st century, it was a playground for dictators where states with the most abysmal human rights records were overrepresented at 56 percent; nearly double that of the freest countries.⁶⁷

The United Nations Human Rights Council which replaced the Commission is a thorn by another name. The current members of the Council include Saudi Arabia, Pakistan, China and Russia. Until recently it also included Libya.

The 53rd report of the Council has multiple resolutions targeting Israel, but only one for North Korea, Afghanistan and Myanmar. "Human Rights in the occupied Syrian Golan" calls on Israel to "release immediately the Syrian detainees" and describes them as "prisoners of conscience."

⁶⁷ http://www.stevesachs.com/papers/paper_hrc.html

These prisoners of conscience are for the most part DFLP terrorists, like those who burst into a Golan Heights dorm in 1975 with axes boasting that their goal was to “Cut off the heads of Israeli hostages”. The resolution passed 31 to 1.

Almost half the resolutions passed by the Council condemn Israel. No other country has been treated likewise regardless of its crimes. But by these actions the Council, like the Commission, holds to its original Soviet-structured mission, of using the UDHR to carry on lawfare against enemy states. The red baton of Communism has been painted the green of Islamism, but it still points in the same direction.

Time and time again the worst human rights offenders continue to receive a slap on the wrist, while the United Nations concentrates its fire on free nations and helps cover up atrocities and protect human rights violators.

Human rights activists had been working for years to extradite former Chad dictator Hissene Habre back to Senegal to face charges for the mass murders carried out under his regime. After Senegal finally agreed to extradite Habre, UN Human Rights

Chief Navi Pilay intervened, telling Senegal that as a signatory to the Convention Against Torture, it could not return him back to Chad for trial where he might face torture. It is hard to find a better example of the UN Human Rights apparatus being employed to protect its violators.

At the twilight of the Human Rights Commission, Kofi Annan conceded that “States have sought membership of the Commission not to strengthen human rights, but to protect themselves against criticism or to criticize others. The Commission cannot be credible if it is seen as maintaining double standards in addressing human rights concerns.”⁶⁸

A similar sentiment from the Rwanda inquiry has already been quoted. But the double standards remain because they are an embedded part of any institution where human rights violators hold sway. A democracy of tyrants cannot protect human rights. Instead like the Soviet Union in 1946, or the Organization of Islamic Cooperation today, its members will participate to protect themselves and to attack others.

⁶⁸ A More Secure World, Feb 2005, XVIII 283, Page 60

The United Nations cannot protect rights that its own members do not respect. Only the United States and other free nations that respect the rights of their own people and of all people can be trusted to do so. And they cannot do it through the United Nations.

Conclusion

There is no serious possibility that the United Nations will reform, because its own bureaucracy is the greatest obstacle to reform. So long as it continues to function, it will remain an enemy of peace and freedom twice over: because of its actions and because of its inaction.

The United Nations has corrupted its ideals and made them into the mercenary tools of tyrants. Worst of all it has done this under the umbrella of international law, a masquerade that has cost countless lives even as its lies have cruelly betrayed the hopes of millions, from the Hungarian freedom fighters to the Tutsi refugees.

Behind the mirage of democracy and human rights is an organization that answers to the worst

elements in the international community. Under the blue flag lies a vast bureaucracy that falsely promises the oppressed peoples of the world that it will protect them, when its interventions occur only to serve its own vanity, power greed, and cowardice.

The UN is a vast global employment agency with no purpose except the perpetuation of its own power and authority. Its lofty buildings and the bustle of its vast armies of employees conceal its underlying corruption and uselessness.

American participation in the United Nations supports the deception that it is an international body capable of fair-minded governance. That deception cruelly betrays the hopes of the weak and the vulnerable and abets genocide, mass rape and terror.

The United Nations has become an organizational assault on its own founding principles. And all the while it undermines the sovereignty and rights of the free member nations who still believe that all men are created equal and that governments derive their authority from the people.

The only way to redeem those principles is to exit its corridors and walk a new path toward an alternative alliance that does more than pay lip service to freedom, democracy and human rights. Only America can be the nucleus of such an alliance. And only when the nation that gave the world freedom leaves the international order that impedes it can a global alliance of free nations truly be born.

