

Peter Haralamos ©

September 10, 2005

### **The United Nation's Future**

The United Nations, should it be replaced, reformed or discarded? The UN has been in existence for 60 years now, and has yet to change the world in the ways it was envisioned to during its inception. Recently it has been full of scandals, corruption and incompetence. Members of congress have called upon Kofi Annan to resign because of his personal association in the oil-for-food scandal. Troops have been accused of sexually exploiting and abusing young girls in Africa and gunning down unarmed troops in Congo. The UN is made up of many terrible communist dictatorships that are known for their destruction of human rights such as China, Cuba, Libya, Sudan and Zimbabwe. The UN charter does not respect our form of government or the US Constitution.

There have been very little significant discussions on replacing the United Nations to date. If it were to be replaced it most likely would be the same thing packaged under a different name but with new people in charge. The new leaders would still have the same goal in sight, world government. Since replacing the UN lacks sufficient support the only two feasible options are to reform or abandon the incompetent organization.

According to the mainstream media, neo-con talk radio, and most politicians there is only one option for the United Nations and that is reform, but there is a large and growing grassroots opposition to reform that is purposefully ignored by the leaders and media that are often passed off as “conspiracy kooks”. These are the people that favor UN abandonment.

## Policy Options

### UN Reform

The first area of reform worth discussing is the replacement of the Secretary-General, Kofi Annan. Two major contenders are interested in the position and seeking endorsements from nation states, Jayantha Dhanapala, a Sri Lankan presidential advisor and Surakiart Sathirathai, the deputy prime Minister of Thailand. They both are widely recognized, as having more political and administrative skills than the current Secretary-General. At the moment Surakiart Sathirathai seems to be the more likely candidate, but Mr. Dhanapala is winning support by promising to mend US - UN relations spoiled by the war in Iraq. The Current Secretary General Mr. Annan has refused to resign and has introduced his own brand of reform for the UN.

On March 21, 2005 UN Secretary General, Kofi Annan released a report titled, *In Larger Freedom*, that outlined what he thought would be the necessary changes needed to reform the UN into a respectable organization again. A summary of the reforms is as follows.

#### **The UN Reform Package**

- Enlarge Security Council from 15 to 24 members - currently the Security Council includes China, France, Russia, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and the United States of America. Their most significant responsibility is to approve, organize, and support military and economic efforts of the UN
- Streamline General Assembly agenda
- Introduce new guidelines for authorizing military action

- Replace Commission on Human Rights with Human Rights Council
- Introduce zero tolerance policy on abuses by UN peacekeepers
- Improve co-ordination of environment and development aid agendas

President Bush, his administration, along with his soon to be appointed Supreme Court Judge, John Roberts and UN ambassador nominee, John Bolton, enthusiastically supports this list of reforms. With this kind of high-level support it seems that this strengthening of the UN that is disguised as reform will surely be the policy of choice.

The House of Representatives recently passed H.R. 2745, which is also known as the United Nations Reform Act of 2005. This piece of legislature threatens to withhold US dues to the UN if a specific 39 reforms are not met. These reforms are also intended to increase the UN's powers instead of actually reforming the organization. This legislation essentially will allow the UN to create a peace building force funded by the World Bank and the IMF in order to protect any governments from domestic conflicts no matter what the cause. The UN peacekeeping forces could even be used to overpower people desiring freedom from oppressive regimes. The UN Reform Act also redefines terrorism very broadly, which allows the organization to capture, detain and eliminate anyone they deemed a threat. This act also encourages the UN to intervene on behalf of peace, therefore superseding any nation state's constitution or government in the name of promoting the internationalization of free countries.

### **UN Abandonment**

“The coming of a world government is longed for by all the worst and distorted elements. This state...would banish all national loyalties. In it, no acknowledgement would be made of the authority of a father over his children, or of God over human society. If

these ideas are put into practice, there will inevitably follow an unheard-of reign of terror.”(Pope Benedict XV, July 25, 1920)

A quote from the Pope who saw the beginning of the creation of world government unfolding before his eyes as hatched by the international bankers of the early 1900's. It would be many years and failed attempts later before we would see the successful effort toward world government that now exists.

The League of Nations was the first failed attempt at world government, which would have been created by the Treaty of Versailles. If it were passed it would have created an international army used for international conflict. Despite President Wilson's ardent support of the League of Nations the American public did not accept it and convinced the “irreconcilables” (a group of senators large enough to prevent two-thirds vote) to oppose the League.

In 1944 President Franklin Roosevelt knowing he would not have enough support as he did during WWII to create the UN, scurried to craft the financial backbone of the organization just before the war ended, the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund (IMF). One Year later the UN was created. Then in 1946 the Global Trade Organization was created and assumed the power to control the world's economy. Since then the agenda outlined in a study carried out for the department of state by Lincoln P. Bloomfield named *A World Effectively Controlled by the United Nations*, has been followed almost exactly, leading us to the ever increasingly powerful organization we have today. This bold study proposes such ideas as systematic disarmament of all nation states, mandatory inclusion to the UN's supreme laws, courts and general whims, a huge sea, air, land and space military force, and unrestricted inspection of nuclear research and power equipment,

strategic areas and industries, administrative policies and operations, and other key and strategic points in the national economy of all its member nation states. (Bloomfield 1962)

Getting the United States out of the United Nations is a feasible and wise choice for the American people. It serves no purpose. All of the supposedly beneficial attributes it offers are already in place and run much more efficiently by United States Officials. We have embassies, ambassadors and diplomats that perform all the major tasks that the UN is doing. It has outlived its usefulness and must be abandoned.

Removing ourselves from the UN should not be viewed as an “isolationist” approach to treating the world, but as an active policy of non-interventionism. America and the UN do not need to be circling the globe forcing democracies on countries and people who don’t ask for, or want them, in order to make them more compatible with our way of life and form of government. Violent terrorist attacks on Americans and their allies would likely decrease due to the fact that we would not be sticking our noses where they don’t belong and upsetting religious fundamentalists. If all they want is to be left alone, then we should leave them alone.