

China, Russia Seek To Revive Founding Spirit of United Nations

March 1—The United Nations Security Council met in special session Feb. 23, at the instigation of its Chinese chairman, to discuss “Maintaining International Peace and Security: Reaffirm the Strong Commitment to the Purposes of the Charter of the United Nations.” The UN is celebrating its 70th anniversary this year. Representatives of 80 nations participated, each speaking for five minutes on the subject at hand.

Those purposes, shaped in large part by the vision of U.S. President Franklin D. Roosevelt and first enunciated in the Atlantic Charter of 1942 (see *Documentation*), are defined as follows in the UN Charter:

“The purposes of the United Nations are: To maintain international peace and security, and to that end: to take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace, and for the suppression of acts of aggression or other breaches of the peace, and to bring about by peaceful means, and in conformity with the principles of justice and international law, adjustment or settlement of international disputes or situations which might lead to a breach of the peace;

“To develop friendly relations among nations based on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples, and to take other appropriate measures to strengthen universal peace;

“To achieve international co-operation in solving international problems of an economic, social, cultural, or humanitarian character, and in promoting and encouraging respect for human rights and for fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion; and

“To be a centre for harmonizing the actions of nations in the attainment of these common ends,”

That these objectives have not been adhered to is obvious. But, are they even shared by the leading na-



Chinese Foreign Minister Wang Yi

tions of the Security Council? The debate brought to the fore the conflict between those advocating war on sovereign states as a means of “resolving disputes,” and those insisting upon cooperation among all nations, however small, as equals. The outcome may well be decisive for the fate of all mankind.

China Against Unilateralism

After a brief opening statement by UN Secretary General Ban Ki-moon, who stated that

“sovereignty remains a bedrock of international order,” but should not be “viewed as a wall or a shield,” Chinese Foreign Minister Wang Yi took the floor.

Wang invoked the anniversary of the victory over fascism, which also occurred 70 years ago, and the importance of the UN Charter in the attempt to forge world peace in its wake. He particularly took aim at the tendency of certain nations to act unilaterally—as the United States has on an increasing number of occasions over recent decades.

“In China’s view,” he said, “any unilateral move that bypasses the Security Council is illegal and illegitimate. The Security Council needs to take more precautionary measures to forestall conflict and act in a timely manner to stop warfare so as to restore peace and promote reconstruction as early as possible.”

Xinhua reported, “Wang said China calls upon all countries, major countries in particular, to step up awareness of cooperation and abandon the mind-set of confrontation, working hard to resolve major problems hampering the world’s peace and regional development through consultations.” Wang continued, “The old mindset of confrontation should be discarded, and consultation and cooperation among the parties should be encouraged if we are to address the major issues affecting world and regional peace and development.”

Wang pointed out that no country is entitled to impose its own will on others or to topple the legitimate governments of other countries. “We should make sure that justice, not hegemony, will prevail in the world,” he said. *BRICSPost* noted today, with understatement, that Wang’s point was “an apparent jibe at the US.”

Wang said, “We should work with each other with a win-win, not zero-sum approach. We call upon all countries to come together to share rights and obligations and uphold justice while pursuing interests.”

Russia Hits the Same Theme

Russian Foreign Minister Sergei Lavrov spoke next, emphasizing that the UN Charter was a “vital source of international law,” and had established a system which, despite the Cold War, “formulated the key elements of a polycentric world order.”

This has now been repeatedly violated, he continued, citing the “bombing of Serbia, the occupation of Iraq, under a patently false pretext,” “as well as gross manipulation of the UN Security Council mandate that resulted in destruction and chaos in Libya.”

All of these are the consequences of “attempts to claim domination in global affairs and control everyone everywhere, and the unilateral use of military force in the pursuit of selfish interests,” he added.

“In pursuit of the illusion of global domination, an array of rotten methods are used, such as intense pressure on sovereign states, and attempts to force upon them outside political, economic, and ideological decisions and standards. For those who don’t go along, there are techniques for instigating internal disorders and regime-change operations. One such case is the open encouragement of the anti-constitutional coup d’état in Ukraine a year ago.”

He attacked the imposition of unilateral sanctions, outside of the Security Council, another intentional destruction of the intended purpose of the UN itself.

Lavrov said, “The topic suggested for discussion is urgent: On the eve of the UN’s 70th anniversary, it allows us to critically assess the state of international relations and discuss ways to overcome accumulated systemic problems and correct them before it is too late.... We believe it is necessary to immediately take decisive measures to reject double standards in world politics, to return the Security Council to the role of a leading body on coordination of collective approaches relying upon respect for the cultural and civilizational

diversity of the modern world, democratization of international relations.”

The Anti-Sovereignty, War Party

Numerous nations, including several former Soviet republics and British Commonwealth nations, countered the Russians, denouncing them by name, and, in some cases, insisting upon military intervention to protect “human rights.”

Most rabid in this direction was President Obama’s UN Ambassador, Samantha Power, who called for making changes at the UN to end the last remnants of the guarantees of sovereign rights in the UN Charter, even while lying that Russia must be denounced and countered for a supposed breach of sovereignty in Ukraine. The UN must back the United States, she said, in waging war on Syria, which she accused of torture, murder, forced starvation and other heinous crimes—without a mention of the U.S.-backed insurgency in Syria which has in fact spawned, and armed, the ISIS and al-Nusra terrorist operations. The UN’s “failure to act” in Syria has “let down the people,” she fulminated.

While she denounced Sudan and North Korea, she focused on Russia for “flaunting the UN Charter” in Ukraine, demanding that the UN “find a better way” to counter Moscow. Power said that some people argue that human rights are not connected to the issues of peace and security, and thus do not warrant military intervention against a sovereign state. To Power, and the Blairites whose philosophy she shares, economic progress is divorced from “human rights,” and war will bring peace. Shades of Orwell’s *1984*.

Power even denounced the fact that “50 countries have restrained the rights of NGOs over the past two years”—implying that this qualified these wrong-doers for military intervention.

British Ambassador Mark Lyall Grant backed up Power’s imperial rant, adding that human rights offenses are an “early warning of coming conflicts,” and that the UN must thus adopt a new view of security, to consider human rights violations as justification for military intervention.

Spain’s Ambassador, Román Oyarzun, added a new twist, indicating that his country had introduced a motion to change the Charter, preventing the use of a veto by the Permanent Five—U.S., U.K., France, Russia, and China—“in cases where atrocities have been proven.” Proven by whom?

Documentation

The Atlantic Charter

The official text of the Atlantic Charter, signed by President Franklin D. Roosevelt and Prime Minister Winston Churchill on Aug. 14, 1941, aboard ship in Placentia Bay, Newfoundland.

The President of the United States and the Prime Minister, Mr. Churchill, representing H.M. Government in the United Kingdom, being met together, deem it right to make known certain common principles in the national policies of their respective countries on which they base their hopes for a better future for the world.

1. Their countries seek no aggrandizement, territorial or other.



U.S. Navy

President Franklin D. Roosevelt (left foreground), seated alongside Prime Minister Winston Churchill, aboard the HMS Prince of Wales during the Atlantic Charter Conference. The Charter set the guidelines for what would later become the United Nations.

2. They desire to see no territorial changes that do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned.
3. They respect the right of all peoples to choose the form of Government under which they will live; and they wish to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them.
4. They will endeavour with due respect for their existing obligations, to further enjoyment by all States, great or small, victor or vanquished, of access, on equal terms, to the trade and to the raw materials of the world which are needed for their economic prosperity.
5. They desire to bring about the fullest collaboration between all nations in the economic field, with the object of securing for all improved labour standards, economic advancement, and social security.
6. After the final destruction of Nazi tyranny, they hope to see established a peace which will afford to all nations the means of dwelling in safety within their own boundaries, and which will afford assurance that all the men in all the lands may live out their lives in freedom from fear and want.
7. Such a peace should enable all men to traverse the high seas and oceans without hindrance.
8. They believe all of the nations of the world, for realistic as well as spiritual reasons, must come to the abandonment of the use of force. Since no future peace can be maintained if land, sea, or air armaments continue to be employed by nations which threaten, or may threaten, aggression outside of their frontiers, they believe, pending the establishment of a wider and permanent system of general security, that the disarmament of such nations is essential. They will likewise aid and encourage all other practicable measures which will lighten for peace-loving peoples the crushing burden of armament.