

# Not the UN

by: Rabbi Jeremy Rosen

Calls for the United Nations to send peacekeepers into Lebanon are a sick joke. Have we forgotten that previously Indian UN peacekeepers lent their uniforms to Hezbollah? Indeed, are we all unaware that there are UN "peacekeepers" in Southern Lebanon still, at this very moment? What HAVE they been doing?

The United Nations is useless and it should be scrapped. Its so-called peacekeepers have never kept the peace, but have certainly brought corruption, mendacity and sexual exploitation to wherever they have been sent. And, of course, the United Nations itself is so hamstrung by politics that it cannot even get agreement on the ethnic cleansing and genocide in Darfur, or deal with Iran or North Korea's rogue nuclear policies (I say rogue because other countries which have nuclear capability do not make a point of threatening to obliterate others). It stood by and let the Rwanda Massacres take place. It allowed Srebrenica Massacres to happen before its very eyes. As for the infamous oil deals with Saddam Hussein's regime, the subsequent reports have all agreed that corruption was endemic and overwhelming.

You will doubtless think I am biased because the United Nations debates and votes on about 35 anti-Israel resolutions each year and spends millions on special bodies designed exclusively to condemn Israel alone while doing nothing about the millions of Muslims and Christians killed by corrupt Muslim states. Yes, it's true—I do think balance and reciprocity is an issue. I am all for condemning any betrayal of human beings, any dehumanization of God's creatures, wherever and by whoever perpetrates them. But to single out one state, whose victims pale in comparison to others in terms of number and degree of torture applied, is simply proof that we are not dealing with honest people.

Winston Churchill is reported to have said that he was in favour of the UN even if it was only a "talking shop" because "jaw jaw was better than war war". I concede that if they were mutually exclusive then obviously talking is better than fighting. But it is not the case. The "jaw jaw" goes on while the 'war war' continues. So what then is the point of "jaw jaw" if it is totally ineffective?

Why should millions be spent on an incompetent and impotent talking shop when the money saved could rid the world of malaria and bring drinkable water to millions of humans? Instead, corrupt representatives of sick and failed regimes go to New York to have a great time doing nothing more than spouting hypocritical, unconsidered platitudes to an audience of closed minds. It's not the UN that ever gets anywhere challenging the USA. It was its own Supreme Court which stopped the processes at Guantanamo Bay.

As Edward Luttwack has shown, wherever the United Nations has intervened it

has only prolonged the conflict and the agony. In the bad old days nations fought each other and large numbers were killed. But at least there was a resolution. Some survived, some did not. Human affairs have always been about shifting alliances, moving populations, refugees, victims and victors. We Jews have suffered more than most from the vicissitudes of history because we've been around longer than anyone else and gone through more than anyone else. And we know that defence starts at home. But we also know that a weak policeman is often far worse than no policeman. With no policeman you know the odds and you decide to fight or concede. With a weak or corrupt policeman you never know what new factor enters the arena, what dirty tactics might be employed while your hands may be tied behind your back.

One of the saving graces of the United Nations is said to be its agencies. Some of them may indeed do some good, but you don't need the UN for them. They could perfectly well exist independently as do World Trade organisations. Some of their agencies are simply bodies that are paid to perpetuate strife, like the UN agencies in Palestine that say that they have to allow anti-Israel and anti-Semitic material to be used in their school because otherwise they would not be trusted. Of course, "Trusted by whom?" is the question. Indeed, when it comes to aiding Palestinians, who are so poorly served by their leadership, in a humanitarian way (as opposed to giving them money for arms) it is clear that help comes neither from the UN nor the Arab States (who appear to use them as tools to distract their own malcontents) but rather from Europe, the USA, and, ironically, Israel.

Another example of UN moral corruption is the Human Rights Council, supposedly a reformed version of the discredited Commission on Human Rights which became such a laughingstock with countries such as Zimbabwe, Libya or Saudi Arabia presiding. It was officially replaced last March but, of course, the reform was totally fudged. So here we go again with a council that includes Russia and Azerbaijan, and in which 16 of the 29 states involved come from Africa and Asia and half of them are Muslim. And what is the first thing they have to deal with? What is the world's biggest problem? Where are most Muslims being killed nowadays or most citizens being jailed for dissent? Not Darfur, not Zimbabwe, not China, not Kashmir, not Iraq, not Saudi Arabia, not Syria, not Lebanon, no. Guess who? No, don't bother. Not even the combative US ambassador, John Bolton, can get anywhere with these apologies for "statesmen". For humanity's sake scrap it. Save the cash. Donate it to the poor or give it to Bill Gates. I trust him more than the UN.

I'm not sure that bombing Lebanon in general brings peace, even if Hezbollah uses civilians as shields for its supplies and launching pads and its Prime Minister declares that Hezbollah IS Lebanon. But I do think destroying Hezbollah and standing up to Syria and Iran will help. Greater experts than I have stated that Hezbollah is not interested in Palestinians or Sunnis or, indeed, Lebanon. But don't expect the UN to care. Whatever Israel does, it must not consign its safety to these jokers.

[submit feedback](#)