

Not So United Nations

The United Nations has been problematic for us here in the USA since its inception in 1945. While its original purpose was predominantly that of maintaining international peace, it has become largely focused on promoting social progress, one of its secondary purposes.

In this regard, the UN is a progressive-liberal organization, which often works against American interests. America bashing is a favorite pastime of UN “diplomats” and bureaucrats, who are happy to take our money and live on our soil, but don’t really think the most powerful nation in the world should have any say in international affairs.

The UN has grown in power and influence, largely because of American economic and military prowess. When peacekeeping troops need to be sent into war-torn areas, they are largely American troops. When money needs to be given to help with any of the UNs many social programs, it is largely American money which is given. Yet these troops and money don’t really buy us a thing.

Part of our current problem with the UN is that they have largely been co-opted by the movers and shakers behind the one world government movement, some of the most financially powerful people in the world. I suppose this is a natural outcome of an international organization like this, where the lines between advising and governing can easily become blurred.

The UN Charter never gave them any governing authority; that’s something that they’ve gradually tried to assume over the years. They’ve now reached the point where they think they can dictate to sovereign countries, expecting those countries to obey their “resolutions.”

Such is the case with a recent vote that the United Nations

took against the United States. First in the Security Council and then afterwards in the General Assembly, the United Nations voted to demand that President Donald Trump rescind his recent order to move the US embassy from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem.

It's important to note that President Trump didn't make a unilateral decision to defy world opinion and move the embassy; all he did was give an order to obey long-standing US law, approved by both houses of Congress in 1995 and signed into law by then-President Bill Clinton.

Actually, he is on even more solid legal ground in making this decision, in that all he really did was decide to not sign an order delaying the implementation of that move another six months.

The original law, called the Jerusalem Embassy Act, required the State Department to move the embassy by an established deadline. However, the sitting president had the authority, under that law, to extend the deadline by six months at a time, if he determined it was necessary to protect national security interests and so reported to Congress.

Ever since the Jerusalem Embassy Act was signed into law, presidents have had to make a decision every six months about whether or not to move the embassy or to sign another six month waiver.

When the first due date came up under Trump's administration, in June, he signed the waiver. However, this time he did not, but instead informed the Palestinian Authority and the State Department that he was going to put that law into effect.

This fits Trump's other actions perfectly, especially his support of Israel and his stance as a law-and-order president. There have been a number of cases now, where Trump has simply declared that the law, as written and approved by Congress, is to be obeyed as is. This is just one more such example.

What makes this different is that Trump's actions (or lack of actions) has international implications. The reason why the Jerusalem Embassy Act was never implemented before was for fear of sparking unrest in the Middle East.

In other words, terrorist organizations were controlling the US Government, through fear. Our country's policies were being dictated by Muslim extremists, overriding Congress and the will of the American people in the process.

But the UN is highly supportive of the Arab nations and Islam in general, while condemning Israel at every turn. The number of "human rights" resolutions which have been declared against Israel has been enormous, while at the same time totally ignoring the human rights violations of Muslims.

Even ISIS beheadings and other executions haven't received anywhere near the attention from the UN as the supposed violations of the rights of Muslims, simply because Israel tries to protect herself from their attacks.

UN objections to Trump's decision were first brought up in the Security Council, where a resolution all but passed condemning his decision. The only reason it didn't pass was the veto right that the United States holds at that table. Only four other countries have that power; China, France Russia and the United Kingdom.

Seeing that the resolution to condemn Trump's decision and declare it "null and void" could not pass the Security Council, a resolution was brought before the UN General Assembly, where it was overwhelmingly approved. Only 9 countries sided with the United States, with another 35 abstaining from voting, which can be seen as not making a decision either way.

President Trump, backed by Nikki Haley, our ambassador to the UN, have made it very clear that the government of the United States considers it unacceptable for countries to vote against

us on such an issue, while still expecting the United States to send them millions or even billions of dollars in aid.

Trump's statement on this was characteristically blunt, "Let them vote against us. We'll save a lot. We don't care." While couched in more diplomatic terms, Nicky Haley's statement to the General Assembly was just as clear, "The United States will remember this day in which it was singled out for attack in the General Assembly for the very right of exercising our right as a sovereign nation."

Arab countries are calling Trump's decision a provocation, likely leading to increased violence in the Middle East. They are trying to pull on the heart-strings of other nations, stating that a stance against the United States on this is taking a stance for peace. But is that true?

If there is increased violence in the Middle East, it won't be because of the US military attacking anyone or even the Israeli Defensive Force attacking anyone; it will be because of Arabs attacking someone. In other words, they're saying that Trump is fostering war by not bowing down to their demands, the exact same argument that Adolf Hitler used to get Europe to allow him to take over neighboring countries in the early days of World War II.

"Do what I want or I'll be violent" isn't pretty when it comes out of the mouth of a two-year-old and it's no better when it comes out of the mouth of a seasoned diplomat. The only real difference is that all the two-year-old can do is throw a temper tantrum, while a nation state can use warfare to show their outrage. But resorting to violence just to get your way is equally immature in either case.

It's actually not surprising to see Muslim-controlled countries acting in this way; they've done so for years. It comes out of their understanding of the Koran, which tells them that they are to rule the world. They make such demands,

because they believe that Allah has given them the right to.

But that doesn't make it right or make them right. It merely demonstrates that they are ignoring the rights of other people, who have other beliefs. Their Koran gives them the right to do that too.

At this point, Trump has to go through with his announcement; if for no other reason than to show that we will not be bullied, either by terrorist threats or by nation-states. If he backs down, he will be stating that the UN has the right to rule over the United States of America, something that is totally unacceptable and contrary to our Constitution.

Video First Seen on [CNN](#)

Rather, he must take a stand, even with much of the world against him; and he needs to put teeth to that stand. Nicky Haley has already started doing that, having negotiated a \$248 million reduction in the United States' contributions to the UN. I wouldn't be surprised to see further reductions in the future.

Of course, UN officials are bemoaning the loss of income, stating that they won't be able to continue spreading their bureaucratic feces over the face of the Earth. That's not the way they're saying it, hiding their complaints under concerns about the poor and needy in the world. But as with most places where the liberal left demands money to help the poor, the poor who get helped the most are the bureaucrats who administer those programs.

They need not worry though, China has claimed that they'll step up, contributing what the United States is no longer giving. That's a bit of a joke as well, considering that China is well-known for their own human rights violations. How can they claim moral superiority by helping others, when they oppress their own people?

This once again raises the question of the United States leaving the UN, something that I have supported for a long time. But I must say, I have been forced to change my opinion on that. The United States plays a very important role in the UN, although not the one that most people would expect.

Our greatest contribution to the UN is in using our veto power, as a permanent member of the Security Council. Were we to abandon our membership in the UN, we would lose that.

So what? You might ask. There would be two immediate results of our losing that veto power. The first would be to see the United States officially condemned in every way possible. Countries who we have treaties with would be pressured to cancel their agreements with us.

This includes countries which allow US bases on their soil. That has National Security implications, not only for us here at home, but for our allies around the world.

The United States has been the only country which has protected Israel in the UN, although we have not done so very well during the years when we had Democrat presidents. Losing our veto on the Security Council would see every sort of sanction possible put in place against them.

There's a good chance that Israel would be lost, if not immediately, then within a few short years. And we would be responsible for allowing it to happen.

Finally, whether we like it or not, the United States is the world's police. We are the ones who guarantee the peace of the world, such as it is. We are the ones who protect the poor and weak. We are also the ones who hold imperialistic forces in the world at bay. Regardless of how or why it happened, this is an important responsibility that we hold. We cannot abdicate.

We must remain in the United Nations, even as they turn more

and more against us. However, that doesn't mean that we have to continue allowing them to do whatever they want, merely accepting that they send us the bill. Rather, we must exercise our influence in an even greater way, as we see President Trump and Ambassador Haley doing.

Controlling the purse strings is a good way of pulling in the UN's collective horns a bit. I am sure there are other things we can do, exercising our influence for the good of mankind, rather than the good of the one-worlders.



World's Smallest Battery Powers House For 2 Days

[Watch Video >>](#)