Mission Perverted

The United Nations was created to prevent war and establish a forum for the Family of Nations, but it has lost its way as a beacon of hope and as a world champion for peace, justice and human rights. The UN has allowed a coalition of nations to turn the organization's machinery into an instrument for bashing Israel.

Established in 1945 to promote peace between nations, the UN has been hijacked by Arab states and some Third World nations who manipulate it to promote their anti-Israeli, anti-American and anti-Western agendas.

> What is anti-Zionist? It is the denial of the Jewish people of a fundamental right that we justly claim for the people of Africa and freely accord all other nations of the globe.
>
> *Reverend Martin Luther King Jr., 1968*

> What takes place in the Security Council more closely resembles a mugging than either a political debate or an effort at problem solving.
>
> *Former U.S. ambassador to the UN, Jeane Kirkpatrick, 1983*

A Short-lived Honeymoon

The 1947 UN decision to recommend establishment of a Jewish state in part of Palestine, was the result of a unique constellation of forces – one being guilt over acts of commission or omission that made the Holocaust possible, and the other, the Cold War rivalries that prompted the Soviet Union to seize the opportunity to undercut British hegemony in the Middle East.

The honeymoon was exceedingly short lived and throughout its history, Israel's relationship with the UN has grown progressively worse. The number of UN meetings and votes against Israel is so out

of proportion to the number of resolutions about other world crises, that the record suggests a clear UN bias against Israel.[1]

In the past three decades, the organization has abandoned any semblance of fairness or neutrality, ignoring and distorting facts to accuse Israel of always being the aggressor in the Arab-Jewish conflict. It brands Israel as the perpetrator of fabricated human rights violations, while it is mute when atrocities by other nations cry out for redress, crushing any hopes that the UN might serve as a higher moral authority in world affairs.

Hypocrisy and Diversion of Purpose

The UN's record of hypocrisy and its singling out Israel as a global punching bag is detrimental to Israel's image and stature in the world community. It has paralyzed the UN, preventing the international community from addressing other problems around the world.

The UN was quick to condemn Israel for an alleged massacre against Palestinian Arabs in Jenin in 2002. The UN's own fact-finding investigation later found no evidence to support its accusation,[2] and yet the UN remains silent about proven atrocities around the world, including those in Sudan, Bosnia and Chechnya [3]

On the day of the bogus Jenin massacre, 31 innocent civilians were slaughtered by Islamic militants in Algeria. The UN did nothing. There was no Security Council call for an emergency session or debate.[4] Nor did the UN condemn or order an investigation of the 108 combatants slain on that same day in Colombia, where a civil war has been raging for 38 years. The UN has yet to address the issue of 50 rebels killed by Ugandan soldiers as part of a war on the Sudanese-Ugandan border.

The UN's hypocrisy and inaction harms the entire free world.

For 40 years, the UN turned a blind eye to the disenfranchisement of Israel, and barred it from serving in various roles at the UN. The

---

1 Emanuel A. Winston, "UN Planned State of Israel as a Still-Birth," July 11, 2002, see: http://www.cdn-friends-icej.ca/un/stillbirth.html Since July 2002, the UN Security Council has adopted 175 resolutions; 97 were against Israel, four were against perceived Arab interests. The Security Council has "condemned," "censured," "deplored," or "strongly deplored" Israel 49 times. It never has used such language against Arab member states. Likewise, the UN General Assembly has cast 55,642 votes against Israel, as opposed to 7,938 votes cast with or for Israel.

2 "UN: No evidence of Israeli massacre at Jenin," *CNN*, August 1, 2002 at http://www.cnn.com/2002/WORLD/meast/07/31/un.jenin.report/.

3 Letter to the Norwegian Nobel Committee on UN's silence, 2001; see: http://www.petitiononline.com/annan/ "Russia: UN Chechnya Vote Assailed," Human Rights Watch, April 19, 2002, in which the human rights group assailed the UN Commission on Human Rights for its failure to adopt a resolution on Chechnya.

4 Dov B. Sischer, "A Day Like Any Other," *NRO*, May 15, 2002 at http://www.jccalendar.org/Articles/Fischer-A day like any other.asp.

agency also abused "emergency measures" as another way of isolating Israel.

The rules of the world body have also been stacked against the Jewish state. Since the inauguration of a regional structure in the 1960s, Israel for more than 40 years was blocked from membership in the Asian group that is dominated by Islamic states, leaving Israel ineligible for membership on the Security Council, where the composition of non-permanent members is based on regional representation. Under the same rules, Israel has also been blocked from sitting on other important committees that debate and draft resolutions before they advance to the General Assembly.[5]

It wasn't until 2000 that Israel, with pressure from the United States, was finally admitted to a regional group – in its case the Western Europe and Other groups - ending what the Council on Foreign Relations labeled "a long sordid story in which Israel uniquely had been excluded from membership in any group."[6]

Palestinian and Arab nations' human rights violations rarely are criticized at the UN. An analysis of the Security Council resolutions through 1989 found that of 175 adopted, 97 were against Israel; four were against all Arab states combined. An audit of General Assembly votes found that the last specifically anti-Arab vote was taken in May 1949. The General Assembly's 1975 Resolution, 3379, equating Zionism with racism, took 16 years to repeal. It was a symbolic move whose success was due to a concerted American effort.

At the same time, the UN has compromised the Geneva Convention's protocols by using them in a manner contrary to their purpose and in gross abridgement of the Convention[7] – in order to bash Israel.[8] At the same time, the UN has refrained from condemning Palestinian combatants who deliberately target civilians, ambush Israelis and disguise themselves as noncombatants – all behavior prohibited under the Geneva and Hague Conventions.[9]

In repeated cases of wars of aggression, ethnic cleansing and genocide since 1949, the High Contracting Parties has failed to meet a single time. It did not meet even in the wake of the 1994 carnage in Rwanda,

---

5 Anne Bayefsky, "Israel's second-class status at the UN," *National Post* (Canada); see also: http://www.cdn-friends-icej.ca/un/status.html.

6 Joshua Muravchik, 'Voting Patterns in the United Nations," Council on Foreign Relations/Freedom House, June 2002 at http://www.freedomhouse.org/pdf_docs/untf/jmuntf.pdf.

7 Keith Landy, "UN gives green light to Palestinian terror," *National Post* at http://mideasttruth.com/np5.html.

8 For the text of the February 9, 1999 resolution "Illegal Israeli Actions in Occupied East Jerusalem and the rest of the Occupied Palestinian Territory," see: http://www.alhaq.org/references/resolutions/resolution_10_6.html. For the speech of Dore Gold, Israel's Ambassador to the UN concerning the resolution "The Emergency Special Session of the General Assembly on Israel and the Fourth Geneva Convention," February 1999 see: http://www.israel-un.org/assembly/emergency/speech1.htm.

9 William A. Levinson, "UN: Assembly of Thugs Who Flout Rules of War," *Times Leader* (Wilkes-Barre, Pa.), June 5, 1998.

when 800,000 people were butchered over three bloody months, most of them with machetes.[10]

The mechanism of "emergency special sessions" designed to cope with crises like the Korean conflict in the early 1950s – has been used to call for "emergency" investigations of "serious" crimes allegedly perpetrated by Israel, like the start of a construction project in Jerusalem. Ethnic cleansing in the former Yugoslavia, genocide in the Sudan and other major world conflicts do not trigger "emergency special sessions."

The United States pays 25 percent of the UN's budget – equal to the combined contributions of 177 UN members.[11] Millions of those U.S. taxpayer dollars are funneled through the UN to internal agencies that have become arms of the PLO propaganda machine. Among them are several special committees, such as the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People, which spends more than $3 million a year[12] on activities such as "Palestine Day."

Bias – Getting Worse by the Day

Perhaps the most obvious sign of the UN's moral bankruptcy lies in the composition of its 2003 Human Rights Commission, headed by Libya.

The chairmanship of the UN Commission on Human Rights for 2003 was held by Libya, a nation implicated in the downing of Pan Am Flight 103 and that served as a refuge for the perpetrators. (The plane exploded over Lockerbie, Scotland in 1988, killing 270 innocent people.) A Freedom House study of 185 UN member states in 1998 named Libya as one of the 13 "worst of the worst offenders"[13] of political rights and civil liberties.

Algeria, Saudi Arabia, and Sudan – all branded as major human rights violators by international audits – sat on the Human Rights Commission in the past, while the United States was blackballed from membership in 2001 and Israel was disqualified. That may explain

---

10 Associated Press report "More than One Million Rwandans Killed in 1990s," *New York Times*, February 16, 2002 at http://www.mtholyoke.edu/acad/intrel/bush/rwandadeaths.htm. Although the UN established an International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda in 1995, human rights activists have often criticized its work as excruciatingly slow and ineffective, allowing some major participants in the genocide to escape being brought to Justice.

11 Jeane J. Kirkpatrick, "President's Essay," Heritage Foundation at http://www.heritage.org/About/kirkpatrick.cfm.

12 "UN Bias Against Israel," *AIPAC*, May 20, 2002 at http://www.aipac.org/documents/aipacfacts17.html.

13 "Survey Finds Majority of UN States Suffer from Weak Rule of Law and Significant Human Rights Violations," *Freedom House*, December 21, 1998 at http://www.freedomhouse.org/media/pressrel/122198.htm.

why *a full 25 percent of the commission's resolutions over the past 30 years*[14] are devoted to criminalizing Israel.

Meeting once a year, the commission adopts about 120 resolutions; three-quarters cover general human rights issues and the remaining votes focus on particular states. The Council on Foreign Relations suggests that Israel suffers a bias not witnessed in other cases.

Country-specific resolutions can be divided into two-categories: those concerning Israel and all the rest. Each year, four to six resolutions are adopted criticizing Israel, usually in language harsher than that used for other states. These include separate resolutions criticizing Israel for its role in Lebanon, in the Golan Heights, in the West Bank and Gaza and in East Jerusalem. Other countries never called for the attention of more than one resolution per year.

The Anti-Defamation League,[15] in a statement to the UN Human Rights Commission in 2003, charged:

> "There is a problem in what is said about Israel, in contrast to what is said about other countries that are mentioned. Condemnations of Israel are in the most inflammatory language imaginable. Condemnations of real violations by other states, when they are noted, are in contrast, phrased in language that is mild, kindly, polite and diplomatic."

Although the nations in question (including Afghanistan, Burma, Burundi, Cambodia, Congo, Cuba, Equatorial Guinea, Haiti, Iran, Iraq, Rwanda, Somalia, Sudan, Uganda, Yugoslavia, and Western Sahara) were guilty of genocide and other grievous human rights violations, the Council for Foreign Relations noted that "in most cases, dictator governments did not have to maneuver against censure because no motion critical of them was presented."[16]

This should come as no surprise. Along with Libya at the helm of the commission, other members included Syria and Zimbabwe. The effect? Countless individuals around the world who put their lives on the line to fight for human rights - in nations where the price is prison, exile or death[17] - are betrayed by the UN. The betrayed include dissidents in Syria who courageously advocated democratic reforms and thereby earned long, harsh prison terms. They also include opposition politicians in Zimbabwe who sought UN support to fight torture under the rule of Robert Mugabe and were stonewalled.[18] Under such UN leadership, millions living under brutal dictatorships like those in North Korea and Turkmenistan, or in Syria, have no place to turn to for protection.

---

14 Anne Bayefsky, "Human Wrongs," *Wall Street Journal*, April 29, 2003 at http://www.frontpagemag.com/Articles/ReadArticle.asp?ID=7553.

15 Statement to the 2003 United Nations commission on Human Rights: Rights of Minorities Item 14(b), B'nai Brith International, May 2, 2003.

16 Joshua Muravchik, 'Voting Patterns in the United Nations," Council on Foreign Relations/Freedom House, June 2002 at http://www.freedomhouse.org/pdf_docs/untf/jmuntf.pdf.

17 Claudia Rosett, "The UN Human Rights Commission is worse than a joke," *Wall Street Journal*, January 22, 2003.

18 Ibid.

The Council for Foreign Relations concluded:

> "…Uneven results flow not only from the cynical presence of tyrannical regimes on the commission, but also from the practice of bloc voting and vote-trading. With one Jewish state and fifty-odd members of the Islamic conference, which caucuses at UNCHR meetings, it is not surprising that Israel gets unfair treatment. Nor is it surprising that regional blocs tend to protect their own. … Nevertheless their inevitable dynamic works to vitiate the purposes of the Commission on Human Rights. Whatever the causes, the overall record of the UNCHR does little credit to the cause of human rights."[19]

The UN and its Secretary-General Foster Child Abuse

The United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East (UNRWA) helps perpetuate the Arab refugee problem, and has allowed it to be used as a political weapon for over 50 years, whereas 70 million displaced persons from World War II have long since rebuilt their lives. That condition not only breeds hatred of Israel, but also stymies the channeling of much-needed resources to refugees in other parts of the globe.

In 1950, the UN Relief and Works Agency (UNRWA) was established to provide *temporary* assistance to Arab refugees who were displaced following the 1948 war, which Palestinian Arabs themselves triggered in their violent opposition to a Jewish state.

The political weight of the Arab world and its allies has ensured repeated extension of the refugee agency's mandate. With a yearly budget of more than a quarter billion dollars, UNRWA is a sprawling welfare agency whose rolls have swelled from almost 750,000 in 1947 to four million today, and whose refugee camps have become breeding grounds and bases for terrorists, and whose residents danced for joy on September 11th and have burned American flags in support of Saddam Hussein.[20]

At the same time, the UN has ignored refugees elsewhere – including North Korea, where over one million persons have starved to death under the dictatorship of Kim Jong-il, largely because the UN High Commissioner for Refugees has failed to provide shelter, food, or safe refuge for North Korean refugees.[21]

---

19 Joshua Muravchik, 'Voting Patterns in the United Nations," Council on Foreign Relations/Freedom House, June 2002 at http://www.freedomhouse.org/pdf_docs/untf/jmuntf.pdf.

20 Claudia Rosett, "Insane Asylum Policy," *Wall Street Journal*, January 8, 2003.

21 Ibid.

UN administrators in Palestinian Arab refugee camps have abdicated responsibility, allowing the schools to become hotbeds of hatred and the camps to become staging grounds for attacks on Israel.

UN-run refugee-camp schools teach hate, as an American reporter who visited one such school in Gaza discovered when he found classroom walls covered with graffiti and posters glorifying suicide bombers.[22] Asked about allegations that incitement to hatred is condoned in UN-run schools, the UN Commissioner General shirked responsibility, noting that UNRWA's mandate leaves curriculum decisions to host nations.[23] The UN could change its mandate or even use the power of the purse strings to influence those in the camps.

Though the UN Security Council prohibits the use of refugee camps as military training grounds, it has never condemned its camps for being breeding grounds and staging areas for terrorist activities. Those activities forced Israeli forces to periodically enter the camps in self-defence - to apprehend terrorist suspects, collect munitions and destroy bomb-making workshops.

When the Israeli Defense Forces (IDF) entered the Jenin and Balata camps in 2002 and discovered illegal arms caches, bomb factories and workshops for making Kassam-2 rockets capable of reaching Israeli population centers,[24] UN officials immediately condemned the Israeli military for entering the camps but not the Palestinian bomb makers.

The UN has turned resolutions aimed at protecting the rights of children into a means of bashing Israel, while silently condoning the use of Palestinian children as combatants.

On the surface, the General Assembly's adoption of three UN resolutions at the end of 2002 on the rights of children should have provided reason to applaud. Unfortunately, the resolutions turned out to be another vehicle in the hands of the Arab bloc to attack Israel.

In the first two years of violence of the *al-Aqsa Intifada* that began in September 2000, more than 100 Israeli children were killed and 900 wounded or maimed. The UN resolutions completely ignore suicide bombers who target places where children gather – discos, cafes, pizza parlors, and even school buses on the way to school and back. The resolutions never condemned the stoning to death of two Israeli teenaged boys who were playing in a cave near their homes, or the terrorist who shot a 5-year-old Israeli child in the head while she hid under her parents' bed for safety.[25]

---

22 Charles A. Radin, "UN Role in Palestinian Camps in Dispute, Critics Say Extremism Appeased," *Boston Globe*, July 9, 2002.

23 "Setting the Record Straight," UNRWA at http://www.un.org/unrwa/myths/index.html.

24 Claudia Rosett, "Insane Asylum Policy," *Wall Street Journal*, January 8, 2003.

25 Anne Bayefsky, "Gentleman's agreement at the UN," *Globe and Mail*, December 23, 2002 at http://www.cdn-friends-icej.ca/un/agreement.html.

One resolution devoted solely to the plight of Palestinian Arab children was debated the same week Palestinian Arab terrorists broke into a house on a kibbutz in Israel and shot two Jewish children, ages 4 and 5, to death as their mother tried to hide them.[26] The special resolution addressing the plight of Palestinian children conveniently ignored the fact that Arab children are used as human shields by Palestinian terrorists who operate out of densely populated civilian areas.[27] The UN also completely ignores the fact that Palestinian children's textbooks inculcate them with a hate for the West, with antisemitism and encouragement to become martyrs . (see the chapter "Children Dying To Kill.")

Political and Human Rights Abusers Run the UN

The UN was founded on enlightened principles, but a majority of UN member states today are undemocratic regimes that abuse human rights and whose citizens lack due process.[28] These states don't uphold justice and democracy at home. And they don't practice or pursue them at the UN or at the International Court of Justice (ICJ).

Devotion to the rule of law and pursuit of democratic principles and basic human rights threaten most UN member states' regimes. A 1998 study showed that most of the UN's 191 members suffer from weak rule of law and engage in widespread human rights violations.[29] Fifty member nations engaged in systematic and widespread human rights violations; another 52 abridged some human rights and failed to enforce the rule of law. That record, the study concluded, suggested that the UN agencies established to enforce universal human rights "are not likely to be fully credible or effective."[30]

Jeane J. Kirkpatrick, former U.S. ambassador to the UN explained:

> "… the United Nations is not a place where issues are decided on the merits of the case. It is not the merits of the case that determine who is condemned for what and when; it is the power structure inside the United Nations.
>
> Again, I offer some examples: Libya is protected from condemnation by its political strength inside the U.N. Israel is attacked because of its lack of political strength inside the U.N. Libya is a member of the Organization of African Unity (OAU), the Organization of the Islamic Conference, the Non-Aligned Movement (NAM). Those memberships protect and empower it."[31]

---

26 Ibid.
27 Ibid.
28 See the Map of Freedom at http://www.freedomhouse.org/pdf_docs/research/freeworld/2001/map2001.pdf.
29 "Survey Finds Majority of UN States Suffer from Weak Rule of Law and Significant Human Rights Violations," Freedom House press release, October 20, 2000 at http://www.freedomhouse.org/media/pressrel/122198.htm.
30 Ibid.
31 Jeane J. Kirkpatrick, "President's Essay," Heritage Foundation at http://www.heritage.org/About/kirkpatrick.cfm.

Thus, the weight of corrupt and cynical regimes with vested interests and naked power politics explains why UN bodies denounce or condemn Israel – the only democratic and westernized Middle Eastern country, according to the Freedom House study, and the only country with few allies and the misfortune of not belonging to any UN regional bloc.

Kirkpatrick's insights clarify how the UN – jettisoning its humanitarian mission – could invite a gun-toting Yasser Arafat to address the General Assembly in 1974, at the apex of a series of terrorist attacks on Israel by Palestinians, including the massacre of Israeli athletes at the 1972 Munich Olympics. She explains how the UN remains so conspicuously silent on Palestinian terrorist acts against Israeli civilians. It's because UN members who think nothing of widespread human rights violations have usurped the UN's power.

One of the most shameful acts at the UN was the passing of a resolution that condones the creation of a Palestinian state using "all available means, including armed struggle," in clear violation of its own Charter.[32] Six European Union states supported the UN vote that effectively sent the message to suicide bombers and their supporters: they have the UN's stamp of approval.

In December 2003, the use of UN organs to bash Israel was expanded to include the UN's judicial machinery. A coalition dominated by oppressive regimes at the General Assembly requested an advisory opinion from the International Court of Justice (ICJ) regarding the "legality" of the non-lethal security barrier Israel build to impede the movements of suicide bombers into Israel, and the "ramifications" of the barrier (on Palestinians only). While the resolution passed the General Assembly without the 'usual' near-unanimous anti-Israel vote, among the 90 supporters of the resolution were, as expected, a plethora of dictatorial regimes and a host of countries that have been named by human rights monitors as some of the worst violators of human rights on the face of the planet.[33] There were 8 votes cast against the request and 74 (!) abstentions including most of Europe.[34] Nineteen of the 189 delegations didn't even show up to vote.[35] The Court collaborated with the General Assembly, handing down a 'ruling' in July 2004 so biased that it found terrorist activities to be irrelevant to its investigation and so sloppy that it assumed the Mandate for Palestine was a founding document for Palestinian self-determination.

---

32 Michael Rubin, "The UN's Refugees," *Wall Street Journal*, April 18, 2002 at http://www.washingtoninstitute.org/media/rubin/rubin-UN.htm.

33 Freedom in The World 2004 at http://www.freedomhouse.org/research/freeworld/2004/table2004.pdf.

34 Saul Singer, "Delegitimizing Israel," *National Review* /http://nationalreview.com/script/printpage.asp?ref=/comment/singer200401230908.asp

35 Pieter H. F. Bekker, "the UN General Assembly Requests a World Court Advisory Opinion on Israel's Separation Barrier," American Society of International Law, December 2003, at http://www.asil.org/insights/insigh121.htm

In addition to Israel bashing, the UN has adopted a decidedly anti-Western bias. The UN is bent on containing American power in the fight against terrorism,[36] thus threatening Israeli and American security.

Because many of the developing nations suffered under Western colonialism, the General Assembly has exhibited an anti-Western bias[37] since the 1960s, when an alliance of Arab and other Third World nations (at times joined by the former Soviet bloc) formed a bloc hostile to the developed world, including the United States and Israel.

The more militant states labeled the United States and Israel "Big Satan" and "Little Satan," respectively, and a Council on Foreign Relations study shows Arab states are the least likely among all UN delegations to support American positions on key UN votes[38] (see graph of voting patterns 1989-2001).

The study found that Arab states voted with the United States in the General Assembly less than a third of the time and the Islamic Conference did so only 36 percent of the time. By contrast, Israel and the United Kingdom are among American's ten staunchest allies in the UN, with Israel voting with America 91.7 percent of the time in 2001, second only to Micronesia (93.2 percent).

Yet since September 11th and the war in Afghanistan, more and more undemocratic regimes around the world have expressed feeling threatened by America's determination to stamp out terrorism and promote democracy. Those feelings are reflected in their UN votes, aimed at containing U.S. power.

In the early stages of the war in Iraq, the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights Sergio Vieira de Mello, distorted the spirit and letter of the Geneva Convention, which protects non-combatants, by suggesting the United States could not legitimately strike military targets if human shields were being used.

Professor Anne Bayefsky, a member of the Geneva-based *UN Watch* and a senior fellow at the Hudson Institute notes:

> "Even in the immediate wake of Sept. 11, the General Assembly has not been able to adopt a comprehensive convention against terrorism. The members of the Organization of Islamic Conference and the League of Arab States have blocked consensus on any common understanding of terrorism."[39]

---

36 See Clive Crook, "The UN Can Serve the Greater Good, or Undermine It," *National Journal*, March 11, 2003 at http://www.theatlantic.com/politics/nj/crook2003-03-26.htm.

37 "United Nations Biased Against Israel?" at http://palestinefacts.org/pf_faq_palestine_un_anti_israel_bias.php.

38 Joshua Muravchik, 'Voting Patterns in the United Nations," Council on Foreign Relations/Freedom House, June 2002 at http://www.freedomhouse.org/pdf_docs/untf/jmuntf.pdf.

39 Anne Bayefsky, "Human Wrongs," *Wall Street Journal*, April 29, 2003 at http://www.frontpagemag.com/Articles/Printable.asp?ID=7553.

By its votes, the UN has said it cannot accept a definition of terrorism that encompasses suicide bombers who blow up Jewish commuters on public buses. Instead, it sanctions Palestinians' "use of all available means, including armed struggle" against Israel. Despite this clear bias, the UN is considered a legitimate member of the Quartet seeking to make peace in the Middle East.

While Americans still have an attachment to the UN – a fond cherished memory of a more optimistic time when people sent each other UNICEF cards and the World Health Organization tried to eradicate smallpox – the United Nation's silence in the face of genocide in Rwanda and in the threat of biological warfare is frightening. After Kofi Annan declared unilateral American action in the Gulf "illegitimate," columnist Charles Krauthammer responded in the *Washington Post*:

> "For the first time, Americans got to see what the United Nations truly is … [not] a global Mother Teresa … but a committee of cynical, resentful ex-imperial powers such as France and Russia serving their own national interests – and delighting in frustrating America's – without the slightest reference to the moral issues at stake.... The test [was] to act like a real instrument for collective security, or die like the League of Nations. The United Nations failed spectacularly.... The principle purpose of the Security Council is not to restrain tyrants but to restrain the United States.... The American public understands that this is not a body with which to entrust American values or American security."[40]

IN A NUTSHELL:

- The UN – established to maintain world peace and protect human rights – has lost its moral compass and its moral authority.
- Most of the UN's money, power, and prestige are invested in protecting the self-interests of corrupt and suppressive regimes, rather than serving as a champion of universal human values. Institutions such as the Geneva Convention, the High Commissioner For Human Rights and UNRWA have been prostituted by politicization.
- Most UN debates and resolutions lack any semblance of objectivity, fairness or enlightened values. Many are simply tools for attacking and defaming Israel and undermining American security and core interests.

- Established as a world body to safeguard humanity from injustice and to protect the world from the horrors of war, the UN has been hijacked to advance an agenda that is anti-Israel and anti-American,

[40] Charles Krauthammer, "Don't Go Back to the UN," *Washington Post*, March 21, 2003 at http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/articles/A1196-2003Mar20.html.