

THE CASE AGAINST THE UNITED NATIONS



IAN GELDARD

At its founding nearly four decades ago, the United Nations was hailed as a step towards the elimination of international conflict. Since then, enthusiasm has been plummeting, particularly in the last ten years. In a statement which would have been unthinkable only a few years ago, Charles Lichenstein — a US delegate to the UN — told a UN committee in September 1983, that if they did not like the way they were being treated in the US, then they should “Seriously consider removing themselves and this organization from the soil of the United States.” And with barely disguised sarcasm added “We will put no impediment in your way and we will be at the dockside bidding you a fond farewell as you sail off into the sunset.”

His blunt statement, daring to suggest publicly that the UN get out of the US, and by implication that the US should get out of the UN, triggered a massive wave of public support for Lichenstein. Calls and telegrams ran 30 to 1 in support of the proposal, confirming what pollsters have known for years: a steady erosion of support for the UN. In 1959 a Gallup Poll found 87% of Americans convinced that the UN was doing a good job; in a Roper Poll released by the UN Association on September 19th, 1983, the figure was down to 10%.

AN INTERNATIONAL BUREAUCRACY

What has prompted this disillusion is the UN's spiralling budget? The UN now spends more than £3bn annually on its agencies and operations. As the 1982 Committee on Appropriations discovered, there is little or no incentive to hold down budget growth or reduce cost, as the vast majority of nations voting on a budget pay in very little. For every £1 million outlay, the 78 developing nations who pay the minimum 0.01% contribution are assessed £100. These countries of course receive far more in aid from each £1m the UN spends than is offset by their £100 investment.

The budgeting procedure is remarkable. The 25 industrial democracies, who represent 14% of the voting members, pay 75% of the overall budget, whilst the voting majority, the 125 members of the so-called Non-Aligned Movement, pay 11%. America pays 25%; the Soviets cover only 10% and are £100m in arrears.

The UN currently employs over 467,000 people in 24 countries, a valuable cover for Soviet, East European, Cuban and other espionage

services hostile to the West. Apart from spies, the UN staff consists of the usual paper-pushers found in any bureaucracy. Of these, the Secretary General Perez de Cuellar has estimated that only one in four of his employees actually does any useful work. Nevertheless, these bureaucrats are well compensated, earning an average 35% more than our civil servants (who are hardly underpaid). Gross pay ranges from £7,500 for a messenger to £72,000 for an undersecretary general. The Secretary General receives £93,000 plus lodging, a limousine, and a £13,000 expense account. Salaries and other staff costs of the secretariat in New York shot up 96% between 1977 and 1980, not surprising when you consider who controls the organization and who gets to pay for it.

HYPOCRISY

What do we get for this onerous and growing financial burden? The UN not only bites the hand that feeds it, but tears flesh from the bone in a crazed blood-lust to attack the West. As many observers have noted, a curious double standard prevails in the UN. Certain target nations (the US, Israel and South Africa in particular) are regularly castigated for real or imaginary crimes: hardly a word is uttered in protest over aggression by the Soviet Union or mass murder in the Third World.

The Republic of China on Taiwan was expelled in 1974. South Africa is not permitted to take its seat in the General Assembly, despite the fact that it was one of the UN's founding members. Israel, however, is the UN's favourite whipping-boy. In 1975, the dictatorships which control the UN passed the infamous “Zionism is racism” resolution and earlier this year condemned Israel as a “non-peace loving state”, only restraining themselves from unseating Israel when the US made it quite clear that it would defund the UN if this was carried out. Nevertheless, the Third World lilliputians and their Soviet allies have succeeded in expelling Israel from a number of UN agencies and have forced through over 150 resolutions condemning Israel.

But, no resolutions have been drafted and passed concerning the Soviet invasion and occupation of Afghanistan, the imposition of martial law in Poland or Libya's aggression against Chad. Similarly, the Soviet invasion of Hungary and Czechoslovakia, and Red China's invasion of Tibet were totally ignored. When it comes to Communist imperialism and Third World genocide, the UN's silence is deafening.

SUPPORT FOR TERRORISTS

The UN has provided aid and comfort to Marxist terrorist organizations throughout the world. A number of PLO front groups are actually financed by the UN: the Committee for the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People (CEIRPP) and the Special Unit on Palestinian Rights were funded the sum of £3,500,000 only last year.

In another gesture which underlies the UN's lack of credibility, the PLO in 1977 was granted observer status to the UN Civil Aviation Organization. Incredibly, the excuse for allowing the PLO to attend meetings that discuss international air security, was that their experience with air piracy could be helpful in the search for protective measures!

When Israel entered Lebanon in 1982, it discovered widespread cooperation and support between UN officials and terrorists. Throughout the war, UN “peacekeeping forces” gathered intelligence for the PLO, and some were caught gun-running behind Israeli lines. Prior to the war, many UN refugee camps were used to train terrorists, not only for the PLO, but for the IRA, Sandinistas and other favoured groups.

In 1974, SWAPO was recognized as the “sole and legitimate representative of the Namibian people”. This despite the fact that SWAPO is one of 45 political parties in South West Africa. From 1977 to 1981, the UN and its agencies channelled £30m, to SWAPO and helped to set up camps in Angola and elsewhere to train SWAPO terrorists. The ANC, a terrorist group operating in South Africa, has also benefitted to the tune of some £6m.

Foreign Policy Perspectives No. 3

ISSN 0267-6761 ISBN 0 948317 01 9



An occasional publication of the Libertarian Alliance,
25 Chapter Chambers, Esterbrooke Street, London SW1P 4NN
www.libertarian.co.uk email: admin@libertarian.co.uk
© 1984: Libertarian Alliance; Ian Geldard.

The views expressed in this publication are those of its author and not necessarily those of the Libertarian Alliance, its Committee, Advisory Council or subscribers.

Director: Dr Chris R. Tame
Editorial Director: Brian Micklethwait
Webmaster: Dr Sean Gabb

FOR LIFE, LIBERTY AND PROPERTY

Again, in Central America the UNHCR (UN High Commissioner for Refugees) camp at La Virtud Honduras is used to supply arms and medicine to Marxist insurgents operating in El Salvador.

The UN's own records show that it has channelled more than £75m to what the UN calls "National Liberation Movements" (NLMs) in recent years. In every instance, these are Marxist-orientated, Soviet backed terrorist movements. Pro-western liberation movements such as UNITA in Angola or the FDN in Nicaragua do not qualify for the UN's generous assistance.

GLOBAL SOCIALISM

Besides its support for the USSR and Third World Marxist movements, the UN has launched a concerted international attack on property rights. US Ambassador Jeanne Kirkpatrick terms the UN's claim for wealth redistribution "global socialism". She states that "the dominant ideology of the United Nations concerning economic regulation is a crude version of Marxist class war". The General Assembly led this attack on the market-orientated economic system a decade ago when it approved the "Declaration of the Establishment of a New International Economic Order" and a "Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States". Among other things the declaration endorsed the right of nations to nationalize foreign business concerns and develop cartels.

Of course there's nothing new about the New International Economic Order (NIEO), it's just oldtime socialism rearing its ugly head again. The programme envisions a huge transfer of wealth from taxpayers in the West to Third World governments in the guise of "reparations". The fact that we are relatively affluent, they impoverished, is offered as proof that they have been exploited, which ignores the fact that our economic system encourages the creation of wealth while Third World governments embrace the wealth-destroying policies of collectivism.

Under the direction of the Group of 77 (its original number), composed of 123 member states and a voting majority in the General Assembly, the UN ceaselessly agitates for implementation of the NIEO. At the 6th Annual Conference on Trade and Development in July 1984, the Group demanded an "immediate action programme" to loot the West of £40 billion over the next two years. UNESCO (the UN Educational and Scientific Organization), with a staff of 23,000 and a budget of £750m, is heavily involved in pushing the redistribution scheme. Thomas Cullick, a policy analyst for the US Heritage Foundation, maintains that arguments for NIEO permeate every sector of UNESCO.

AGAINST THE FREE MARKET

Consider the UN's Economic and Social Council's (UNESC) proposed consumer guidelines. Drafted by a Norwegian socialist, they contain all the old anti-capitalist clichés: "The emergence of the market economy may be accompanied by several practices prejudicial to consumers; shortages may be artificially induced by speculation; buying on credit may give rise to usury; and defective weights and measures and adulterated goods may become commonplace." On the other hand, the study has nothing but praise for collectivism, observing that "States often act on behalf of consumers in the purchase of goods and services and obtain high-quality goods at reasonable prices."

The guidelines call for consumer education (indoctrination) to alert buyers to the nefarious operations of private concerns and support for national legislation "to counter the somewhat unequal relationship between those who produce and sell goods and those who buy them".

THE CASE OF UNESCO

More than any other part of the UN system, UNESCO demonstrates those characteristics, both structural and political which makes a withdrawal from the UN necessary. UNESCO is bad, even by UN standards.

UNESCO deals with ideologically sensitive issues which are in the majority of cases not directly related to the material interests of the Third World majority. Therefore, irresponsible behaviour

can be indulged with impunity, allowing the Third World to work off its frustrations within UNESCO.

Dominating UNESCO is its Director-General Amadou-Mahtar M'Bow (known as "Boss" at the Paris HQ). With an assured majority behind him, having enormous patronage to dispense in the form of well-paying jobs, grants to governments and agencies, together with the prospect of travel to glamorous cities for his trusted supporters, M'Bow has turned UNESCO into his personal vehicle for the promotion of anti-Western rhetoric. He is openly and militantly a spokesman for the Marxist Third World, viewing UNESCO as an instrument to redistribute power and wealth away from the West.

UNESCO's documents and conferences can be baffling for the uninitiated. Essential UNESCOese for the beginner are terms like: "cultural imperialism", the "right to culture" and the "democratization of culture". Through use of these terms, the New World Cultural Order (NWCO) socialist doctrine is blended into all UNESCO discussions on culture. For example, the term "democratization of culture" is used to convey the idea that culture, like wealth, must be "redistributed" to the masses. Why does culture have to be redistributed? Because it is hoarded by the "elites". Who are the elites? They are the Western intellectuals who enjoy the plays, novels, operas and other cultural products generated by capitalism. According to UNESCO, this must be stopped.

Especially threatening, says UNESCO, are the popular forms of western entertainment such as movies and rock music, which pose a danger to "fragile" native cultures. What is the proposed solution to this danger of "cultural imperialism"? State-controlled cultural planning. This would "protect" the masses from "contamination" by western culture and would control the development of culture within a nation according to UNESCO's global plan.

Mrs O'Callaghan is responsible for UNESCO's human rights programme. A Trinidadian and a Marxist, she assiduously promotes the Marxist concept of "people's rights" as opposed to individual rights — dismissed as bourgeois. "People's rights", by their nature collective, are based on ideas of tribal and racial purity, laying a philosophical foundation for the virulent antisemitism of UNESCO officials in their repeated attacks on Israel. "People's rights" also legitimize the infringement of human rights by subverting the individual to the total interest of the state: the "rights" to "solidarity" and "cultural identity" are rhetorical phrases justifying the socialist system.

UNESCO publishes four or five books a week, every week of the year. By 1984 it will have published some 10,000 titles in over 70 languages in addition to about 13,000 documents issued annually. UNESCO's distribution system is formidable — through the National Commissions and other UN outlets in the 158 member states, the secretariat has access to libraries, universities, ministries of education and the media. UNESCO is currently discussing with INTELSAT renting radio and TV channels on as many as three international satellites.

WITHDRAW NOW!

More than a colossal failure and waste of money, the UN is a very dangerous organization, employing Western resources to advance Soviet aims and undermine economic freedom. Far from being an instrument of peace, the UN *promotes* hostility and aggression. It exacerbates conflicts by encouraging member states to take sides on issues not directly concerning them, thereby spawning power blocs and globalizing minor disputes. Ultimately it would become the biggest of all imaginable governments, engaged in an economically collectivist programme covering the world. Backed by sufficient military force to coerce the earth's population to do its will, liberty would be extinguished.

Cobden observed that "peace will come to this earth when her peoples have as much as possible to do with each other; their governments the least possible".

Let's get out — NOW!