

Chapter 1: Unmasking the United Nations



UN's Geneva office

A. The Origins and Flaws of the UN's Vision

By Kase Hideaki



There is probably no country in the world with greater affection for the United Nations than Japan. And yet the Japanese people know little about the United Nations.

The United Nations, being recognized as a temple of peace, has become the center of Japanese faith along with Japan's postwar "pacifist constitution".

Besides, consecutive Japanese governments have declared that Japan's foreign policy is based on the idea that the United Nations is the center of the world.

For starters, nowhere else in the world can one find an international organization with such a name as the Japanese call "*kokusai rengo*" meaning "International Union". Both *kokusai rengo* and *kokuren* for short are mistranslations of the "United Nations." *Kokuren* exists solely in the Japanese mind. Nevertheless, in Japan, the appellations of

“*kokusai rengo*” and “*kokuren*” have become very popular and, so, allow me to use the appellation “*kokuren*” here just as a matter of convenience.

Kokuren refers to the United Nations in English, which is one of the five official languages of the organization. The UN Charter was signed in San Francisco by the fifty-one nations that made up the Allied Nations that fought Japan in June 1945.

The UN Charter begins with the preamble stating “We the peoples of the United Nations...,” which the Japanese Foreign Ministry has correctly translated to this day: *warera rengo koku no jinminwa*.... Here, the “United Nations” is correctly translated as *rengo koku*.

Then the Charter states, “determined to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war, which twice in our lifetime has brought untold sorrow to mankind...”

However, while in the Japanese text, the “United Nations” is translated as “*rengo koku*,” the UN Charter is translated as *kokusai rengo kensho*, instead of *rengo koku kensho*. Here, the translation digresses from the hard and fast rule that a translation should retain fidelity to the original.

The correct name for the “United Nations,” the 39-storied, glass-walled headquarters standing in Manhattan, New York which overlooks the East River, is “*rengo koku*”. Since the birth of the UN, the United Nations is “*lianheguo*” in Chinese, which is one of the five official languages used in the UN.

Likewise, the UN should be called “*rengo koku*” in Japanese. Japan belongs to the same linguistic region where Chinese characters are used. In both South and North Korea, the correct translation is used.

The term “*rengokoku*” was constantly used during World War II and the Japanese people are familiar with it. The correct name of *rengo koku* should be used, as it is.

In Germany, the other nation defeated in World War II, while the former League of Nations was called *Der Volkerbund*, the United Nations is correctly called *Die Vereinter Nationen* meaning “United Nations,” the same organization that Germany fought in the War.

In Italian, the UN is the “*Organizzazione dell Nazioni Unite*” (or “United Nations”).

The name “United Nations” was first adopted as a reference to the Allied Powers on January 1, 1942, following Japan’s attack on Pearl Harbor during the previous month, which triggered war against the United States.

On January 1, 1942, representatives from twenty-six countries which were at war with the Axis Powers of Japan, Germany, and Italy met in Washington, D.C. and promulgated the “Declaration by United Nations”.

The name came from a speech delivered at the conference by President Franklin D. Roosevelt, who proposed that the Allied Powers fighting Japan and Germany be called the “United Nations.” Thus, Japan waged war against the Allied Powers, a.k.a. the United Nations, for three years and eight months, from December 1941.

It was the United Nations Air Force which carpet-bombed Japan’s cities in violation of international law and which slaughtered huge numbers of noncombatants through the dropping of atomic bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

For that matter, to use the term *kokusai rengo* (“International Union”), or *kokuren* for short, which is now so popular among the Japanese people, the “*kokuren*” Air Force inflicted cruel and barbaric bombing of Japanese cities during the previous war.

The United Nations is the appellation of a military alliance of the side which fought against Japan in World War II. At the time of the formation of the UN, the membership requirement was that a nation was a belligerent against Japan. At no point since its creation has the United Nations ever been an instrument for international peace.

As for UN membership, while Article 4 of the UN Charter had stipulated that membership was “open to all other peace-loving states,” the invitation to join was extended only to those nations which had declared war on the Axis Powers, which included Japan and Germany, before March 1, 1945.

Consequently, many countries rushed to declare war on Japan and Germany in order to qualify for membership, as participation in the war against Japan being a requirement

for admission.

The UN Charter (*kokuren kensho* or *rego koku kensho* to be correct) stipulates that membership is “open to all other peace-loving states.” How is it that we can call China and Russia “peace-loving states”? Besides China and Russia, the PDRK (North Korea) and Syria, President Bashar al-Assad of Syria being condemned as enemy of peace by America and European countries, are members of the UN.

This question can be easily answered if we look at the fact that admission to the UN was granted to “peace-loving” countries that declared war on Japan--the UN is not an organization of “peace-loving states.”

The Japanese correctly translated “United Nations” as “*rengo koku*” up until November 1945. In April 1945, representatives from fifty nations met in San Francisco to draft the UN Charter (*kokuren kensho* or *rengo koku kensho* to be correct). At that time, Japan’s Foreign Ministry quite naturally translated the “United Nations” as “*rengo koku*.” The April 25, 1945 edition of the *Asahi Shimbun* published an article headlined “San Francisco Conference Meets Today. Forty-six small countries packed together to dance to the music as planned?” The article reads, “A United Conference to launch an international organization, as it is called, meets here in San Francisco....”

From then on, the “United Nations” continued to be translated as “*rengo koku*.” The *Asahi Shimbun* of August 9 reported under the headline “UN Interim Committee on Security”: “(London, special dispatch) The interim committee of the United Nations security organization decided to meet for the first time in London on the 8th in order to prepare for the establishment of a permanent international organization...”

The *Asahi Shimbun* of November 6 carried an article with a headline “Universal School Textbooks—Cultural Meeting.” The article states, “The first meeting of the United Nations Educational and Cultural Organization...” This organization is UNESCO (the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization). However, starting from an article dated November 27, the “United Nations” (*rengo koku*) came to be translated also as *kokusai rengo*, meaning “International Union.” With the headline: “The General Assembly of the United Nations (*kokusai rengo*) to be held in January,” [London, Nov. 25, UP—Kyodo Press], the article states, “The preparatory committee of the United Nations (*rengo koku*) announced a plan to elect a chairman from among

representatives from small countries. The committee is preparing to hold the first general assembly of the United Nations (*kokusai rengo*) in January next year.”

Although the article is very brief, it is very strange that the United Nations is translated differently as “*rengo koku junbi-iinkai* (preparatory committee)” in one place and as “*kokusai rengo daiikkai sokai* (first general assembly)” in another place. After the end of the war, the alternate name, “International Union,” was ultimately adopted in order to prevent the organization from being an object of popular enmity as the Allied Powers, including America, were. The Foreign Ministry based the mistranslation “International Union” (*kokusai rengo*) on the Japanese name for the prewar League of Nations (*kokusai renmei*).

This kind of deception through euphemism became popular after Japan’s defeat in World War II. For instance, the “occupation army” (*senryo gun* in Japanese) became known as the “stationed army” (*shinchu gun*), lest the Japanese people bear enmity toward the army of occupation.

In fact, this has been a popular practice in Japanese society since ancient times. Even today, Japanese people say “*ohiraki*”, which literally means the “opening of a meeting” at the end of a party, for the sake of good luck. During wartime, the Japanese Army used to insist on referring to “retreats” (*taikyaku*) as “repositioning” (*tenshin*).

Up until the Meiji Era, it was unacceptable to eat four-legged animals, so boar’s meat was called “mountain whale,” while rabbits were equated with birds. Such examples abound.

Likewise, Japan continues to call its military a “Self-Defense Force.” The Japanese people are good at deceiving themselves through changing words in expressions when confronted with inconvenient situations. However, when falsehoods are taken for reality, things may turn troublesome, indeed.

Once the “United Nations” (*rengo koku*) came to be called *kokusai rengo* (the International Union) in Japanese, the true nature of the United Nations has been concealed and completely lost to the Japanese to this day. As a matter of fact, the *kokuren* is a club of the victorious powers of World War II. This being the case, the United Nations Charter has the so-called “enemy clauses” for former Axis Powers, including Japan. The clauses allow any of the original members of the United Nations to

use military force against former enemy countries like Japan, freely at any time, without consulting the UN, if it is deemed that any of the former Axis Powers shows any sign of comeuppance.

In Japan, not a few people hold religious devotion towards the UN. However, had the UN been correctly translated as “*rengo koku*”, belief in the UN would never have become so widespread in Japan.

In 1975, ample monetary compensation was offered up by the Japanese government to convince the UN to build the headquarters of the “International Union” University along downtown Aoyama Street in Tokyo. Would we have still wanted to host this university had it been called “The University of the Allied Powers”?

As for Japan’s Constitution, is it really something to be flaunted to the rest of the world as a source of pride by the Japanese? Japanese people euphemistically call it a “pacifist constitution,” but it is actually an unequal treaty in the guise of a constitution, which was imposed by the US Occupation in order to completely disarm Japan and reduce it permanently to vassal status. Although the Japanese people admire their “pacifist constitution,” the truth is that it is a constitution was created to protect the United States.

In the end, can we really rely on the UN to safeguard the peace? The UN Security Council, the supreme decision-making body, is composed of 15 members, 5 of which hold permanent seats and veto power. The remaining 10 are elected for two-year terms by the General Assembly. Since its creation, the permanent members of the Security Council are the United States, United Kingdom, France, Russia and China.

The UN can be compared to a decrepit house that has never been maintained since it was built 70 years ago. Therefore, the UN is totally incapable of coping with the modern world. In this sense, the UN resembles Japan’s Constitution.

In 2014, Russian President Putin seized the Crimea, in defiance of international law. With the Ukrainian crisis, the UN did nothing noteworthy--it was utterly helpless. The UN was unable to act at all, as if it was paralyzed, and that was because Russia holds veto power in the Security Council.

In Japan, the principle of the “UN as the center” has long been used as state policy, but

this is a vain principle since the entity itself has no center to be the center of all. The UN cannot function at all unless the intentions of the five permanent Security Council members, including Russia and China, totally agree, the Security Council being the highest decision-making organ. Therefore, the UN can be described as an organization without a center.

Anyone who knows something about the history of the UN should be aware that the five permanent members rarely reach full agreement. Should Japan be invaded by China, the UN will be unable to do anything about it. China has a permanent seat in the Security Council and will not fail to use its veto power.

Japan has been blind to the reality that the UN lacks a center and that the five permanent members of the Security Council control the UN at their discretion. Rather, Japan has indulged in the naïve, rather foolish, illusion that Japan can rely on the UN as its center of diplomatic policy.

When China arrives to grab the Senkaku Islands by military force, it will be useless for Japan to appeal to the UN for help. We can no more rely on the UN in the case of an emergency than we can sustain our national security and peace through “trusting in the justice and faith of the peace-loving peoples of the world,” as the preamble of Japan’s constitution states.

The Japanese people’s wish for peace in the postwar years is an earnest one, but peace can be achieved only through constant and collective efforts of the people, not through prayer or magic.

The postwar Japanese people have willingly covered their eyes from reality, absorbed in the “illusion of a pacifist constitution” and a “faith in the UN”.

In Japan, the UN has been called “a temple of peace”. Oddly, no other nation in the world has worshipped the UN with such religious devotion. The rest of the world regards the UN as a diplomatic tool or an arena for international disputes. The mistranslated term *kokusai rengo* (International Union) has supported the so-called Japanese “postwar regime”.

However, is it possible for the Japanese people and government to recognize “*kokusai*

rengo” (International Union) as plain mistranslation and decide to use the right appellation “*rengo koku*” (United Nations)? They should certainly do so, but this is not expected to occur anytime soon.

Today, one hundred ninety-three countries belong to the UN. United Nations personnel come from each member country; this mammoth organization is composed of diverse peoples of the world.

Those from Third World countries include the political elite, their powerful supporters and relatives of those in power. The UN post is considered to be prestigious, with a salary being much higher than one can expect back home. Therefore, the UN attracts profiteers who are incompetent or of dubious character.

Despotism prevails in most Third World countries and with immature democracies, officer holders fortunes are made illegally and bribery becomes a way of life. United Nations Headquarters and its sub-organizations have become deplorable extensions of the Third World.

In fact, unqualified personnel as the UN staff causing endless mishaps has become a serious problem at UN Headquarters and within the various UN sub-organizations. It is not rare that reports totally without basis in reality are published by UN sub-organizations.

This is especially so in the case in which committee that deal with human rights There are many countries in which their citizens’ human rights are violated and when such countries speak of “human rights,” this reveals the hypocritical side of the UN and the moral authority of the UN is damaged beyond repair. The UN is far from being a just international organization.

Nonetheless, it is the only formal place in the world where representatives from countries all over the world meet. For that reason, whatever its true nature and quality, the UN still serves as an important diplomatic tool to its members.

On our part, Japan should effectively use the UN as an international forum, speaking up in order to make our voices heard and actions understood.

B. A Useless, Corrupt Organization

By Fujii Genki



The Japanese people's delusion and faith toward the UN is pathetic and beyond words. Mr. Kase Hideaki has already mentioned in his excellent contribution in this book that the UN is an international organization established by the Allied Powers (the victors) during World War II and that it is an extremely unfair system for the losers of the war like Japan. So, allow me to criticize the UN from a different point of view.

One LDP (Liberal Democratic Party) member once criticized the UN as being something like a local "*nokyo*" (Japanese Agricultural Cooperation)—he immediately received a severe bashing from the Japanese mass media. I would say, though, that this comment is extremely insulting to local *nokyo* in Japan. My point is that *nokyo* have substantial functions with great staff and they don't waste resources as terribly as the UN does. The UN is an organization which produces practically nothing positive, spending its huge budget in vain.

Looking at the English abbreviation "UN," which stands for the United Nations, I recall something vividly from memory. It happened in Cambodia. A cease-fire agreement was signed in Cambodia and UN PKO (Peace Keeping Operations) missions began. At that time, I did on-the-spot coverage of PKO missions in Cambodia for two straight years. With dusk, there were rows of white Toyota 4WD vehicles flying the blue UN flag at the prostitution district, which was decorated with small light bulbs. Peace Keeping Operations personnel from various countries rushed to brothels, driving their 4WD vehicles with "UN" painted in large letters on the body of the car and streaming UN flags. Those Third World soldiers are handsomely paid for serving in the PKO. They were gleeful everywhere they went. I could not help but imagine that US Occupation soldiers, right after the end of the war, must have been just like that in Japan.

Allow me to outline out my criticism of the UN, point by point:

- 1) The UN is an international organization that pointlessly wastes its huge budget. In a sense, it is a “paradise of extravagance”. The huge amount of taxpayers’ money Japan contributes to the UN is spent extravagantly by parasites called “high-ranking international bureaucrats”.
- 2) The UN is totally useless when it comes to solving international disputes. Indeed, there are ample occasions when the UN not acting in the humanitarian manner. At its best, the UN is a forum for useless chatter.
- 3) The UN has been reduced to the place where terrorist havens like North Korea, entirely negligent of basic human rights, freely espouse their propaganda. Not only is Japan a frequent target of remonstrance, the United States and Israel are also often targets of attack and criticism by the UN-related bodies.

How are we to use the UN?

In a favorable light, one can say that the UN is nothing more than one of those places where nations compete and fight with each other in the pursuit of their respective national interest. “UN-centered diplomacy” may have a nice ring to it in Japan, even today. In fact, this means nothing and worse still, it is a dangerous conception which actually damages Japan’s national interest. What is necessary for Japan to do is, first, find the determination to fight within the UN and second, take a firm diplomatic stance free of the UN.

What does the term “UN-centered diplomacy” actually mean?

Upon deliberation, I find that it doesn’t make any sense at all. For instance, if a Japanese statesman is to say, “I will promote a policy centering on the Diet. The policy of our party is a Diet-centered principle,” everyone will burst into laughter. It is crystal clear that the center of government is the Diet. What counts is what policies need to be presented and what assertions need to be made in the Diet. That is the role of each political party. The Diet is the place where politicking is performed and consensus is reached.

In the present Japanese political system, the Diet is the highest organ of state power. There is no question about setting the Diet at the center of politics. The phrase “Diet-centered politics” is superfluous.

Likewise, it is absurd to assert a “UN-centered principle”. The important things are

what to assert and to state to the world Japan's national interests through the UN. The UN serves only as a theater for diplomatic negotiations in the pursuit of national interest of each member state. The UN is not the center of international diplomatic activity. While the Diet is the highest organ of state power, the UN is not the highest organ of global politics. It is merely one of many international organizations.

Until today, Japan has contributed a huge amount of money to the UN, but there is hardly a case in which the UN worked earnestly for the benefit of Japan. The whole process is just a waste of time and money. When we think of issues such as the "comfort women" and North Korean abductions, the UN and its related organizations have made little of Japan and without reflection did things which have damaged Japan's national interest and dignity. The UN and its related bodies are often Japan's enemies rather than protectors, doing things against Japan, never for it.

American patriots abhor the UN

I studied abroad in the United States from the late 70's to the early 80's and one of the most impressive things to me was the fact that most Americans who love their country absolutely dislike the UN. When the idea of establishing an international organization called the UN was first conceived, the incumbent U.S. President, Franklin Roosevelt, who was known as a communist sympathizer, made a bizarre compromise with Stalin, the head of the Soviet Union. Stalin stated, "The Soviet Union is a federation composed of 15 republics and, therefore, each of the respective republics will join the UN. Fifteen votes should be given to the Soviet Union in the UN." Stalin simply meant to say that while the United States has one vote, the Soviet Union wanted 15 votes. Even pro-communist Roosevelt was flabbergasted at this extraordinary proposal and turned it down. In the process, Roosevelt compromised with Stalin, allowing Belarus and Ukraine to join as independent states and to hold seats in the UN, in addition to the Soviet Union. Consequently, the Soviet Union is one state that holds 3 votes in the UN.

In Japan, there are certainly many groups of people who concoct hackneyed international political plots. One of these asserts that "The UN was invented by the United States and the UN functions totally according to American wishes." This is the idea that the UN is part of some kind of American conspiracy. The fact is, though, conservative and patriotic Americans dislike the UN. They hate the UN because it has become an arena in which the communists, led by the Soviet Union, are free to act. The Soviet Union made friends with developing countries and led them down an

anti-American path. The UN became an arena for anti-American activities, which made the United States extremely uncomfortable among those UN members. In particular, through the Vietnam War, the United States was harshly condemned and the UN turned into a dangerous place for America. The UN Ambassador at that time, Daniel Patrick Moynihan, who took office in 1975, wrote a memoir, *A Dangerous Place*. The title explicitly reflects the atmosphere at the time. Among patriotic Americans, some even proposed that UN Headquarters be removed from American soil. The piece of land where UN Headquarters stands was donated by the United States to the UN at the time of its establishment. Like embassies of foreign countries, the UN site is extraterritorial and beyond America's sovereignty. The conservative opinion in the United States is that it is hardly acceptable to allow the UN, which usually acts against America's national interests, to own land that is beyond American reach. Among conservative Americans, the UN is not highly regarded.

In 1984, during the Reagan Administration, the United States seceded from UNESCO. In examining America's secession, one will realize not only how the UN sub-bodies waste the UN's huge budget, without any accountability, but also how the UN has become a den for parasites politely called elite, international bureaucrats. UNESCO is one of the UN specialized agencies like the International Labor Organization (ILO) and the World Health Organization (WHO). These agencies fall under the UN Economic and Social Council. Although they carry the UN name, specialized agencies like the UNESCO are bureaucracies separate from the UN itself and have their own budget. The UN Economic and Social Council serves as a bridge between the UN and its specialized agencies.

The American secession from UNESCO began when a Senegalese named Amadou-Mahtar M'Bow was elected director-general of UNESCO. Director M'Bow, utilizing his characteristic ambition, made UNESCO his own mouthpiece and completely dominated it. After the completion of his six-year term, Mr. M'Bow was reelected in 1980. Entering his second term, Director M'Bow displayed sheer enmity against western countries, the United States in particular. His manner in running UNESCO was extremely despotic and in employing the secretariat staff, he preferably admitted those close to him. He intervened in accounting and use of UNESCO funds, he indulged in a luxurious life, living in an expensive apartment in Paris. The Reagan Administration at that time sharply criticized Director M'Bow for his anti-American behavior and for making UNESCO his private agency. The U.S. Government

Accounting Office launched an investigation of UNESCO accounting. However, immediately before the investigation began, an incident of arson broke out at UNESCO Headquarters in Paris and the fire destroyed some important papers. Despite this incident, the United States continued its investigation, which finally revealed that at least \$14 million was not accounted for; UNESCO accounting was totally fictitious. There was further suspicion of UNESCO, in that 70% of all UNESCO staff (3,300) lived in Paris. The Reagan Administration stated that America will leave UNESCO unless Director M'Bow's anti-American actions and internal corruption were corrected. At the end of 1984, when President Reagan was reelected for a second term, the United States walked out of UNESCO. Singapore and the United Kingdom followed suit. It was not until 2003 that the United States rejoined UNESCO, during the administration of President George W. Bush. It is very likely that corruption and meaningless spending can be found everywhere within the UN itself and within all of the specialized UN agencies.

United Nations business is in fact a showcase of wasteful spending and enormous cost overruns. Printed matters are regularly published in astronomically great numbers but hardly used by anyone.

Let me mention one example, which if not for its seriousness would be a joke. The European Economic Committee, which is headquartered in Geneva, under the UN Economic and Social Council, issued three thousand copies of a twenty-four page English language leaflet entitled *Eggs Standard* in 1992. This leaflet carried beautifully printed color photographs of various eggs, from fresh ones to broken ones. The U.S. Ambassador to the UN at that time, Ambassador Pickering, was so shocked at the absurdity of the publication that he immediately protested to the Economic and Social Council in Geneva. This kind of waste is an everyday affair at the UN and its related specialized agencies. One can only guess at the kind of corrupt, maleficence that lies behind the act of printing such an absurd and useless publication.

Though they carry the UN name, the UN Specialized Agencies are actually separate organizations from the UN. Japan contributed a huge amount of money not only to the UN proper, but also to these specialized agencies. Our precious monies are actually spent on extravagance such as expensive champagne, consumed by people like Mr. M'Bow and on unnecessary publications that no one cares in the slightest to read.

Six Main Organs of the United Nations

(Source: 2012 UN Public Relations Center)

General Assembly

Auxiliary organs: Human Rights Council, Disarmament Committee and others
Plans and Funds: United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD)
United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF)
United Nations Development Plan (UNDP)
Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR)
United Nations Environment Plan (UNEP)
United Nations Organization for Gender Equality and Empowerment of Women (UNWomen)
Related agencies: International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA)
World Trade Organization (WTO)

Economic and Social Council

Selected Specialized Agencies: International Labor Organization (ILO)
Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO)
World Health Organization (WHO)
United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO)
World Bank Group
International Monetary Fund (IMF)
International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO)
International Maritime Organization (IMO)
Universal Postal Union (IPU) and others
(sharing Plans and Funds mentioned above with General Assembly)

International Court of Justice (World Court)

Security Council

Auxiliary organs: Counter-terrorism Committee
Military Chief of Staff Committee
PKO: United Nations Mission in South Sudan (UNMISS)

United Nations Mission in Timor-Leste (UNMIT) and others

Secretariat

Various working committees including Sustainable Development Committee
Various regional committees including African Economic Committee
Other committees like Non-Governmental Organization Committee
Departments and offices

Trusteeship Council

(not in action since 1994)

The UN did not prevent China from invading Tibet

The UN is totally at a loss when it comes to coping with the ongoing humanitarian disaster in China, oppression of the Tibetans and Uighurs by the Chinese government. Again, the failure clearly rests on the fact that China is one of the permanent members of the Security Council, the center of the UN, and can exercise its veto power at will. However, even before the People's Republic of China joined the UN and became a permanent member of the Security Council in 1971, the UN was powerless in preventing Chinese aggression against Tibet, which goes back to 1950. In October of that year, a 40,000-strong army of the Chinese Communist Party invaded East Tibet. Against China's attack, soldiers of then-independent Tibet's national army and 8,000 volunteers valiantly fought back, only to be overwhelmed by the Chinese Communist Army. Half of all Tibetan soldiers, nearly 4,000, were killed. On this occasion, the Tibetan government asked the UN, which had already been established, for help. Surprisingly, the representative from India responded with an astounding remark: "It is not suitable to discuss this issue here at the UN General Assembly." The reason was that the UN is not a suitable place for bringing peace among Tibet, China and India. Even the British representative supported the Indian proposal. Subsequently, the plea for help from the Tibetan people was never heard in the UN. The UN did not so much as discuss the issue of Chinese aggression against Tibet.

At that time, India, Britain and Tibet had concluded a tripartite treaty. Both India and Britain recognized Tibet as an independent state. Nevertheless, the UN failed to keep Tibet independent. Six million Tibetan people ended up being victims of Chinese Communist Party aggression. This incident clearly indicates how helpless the UN is. In spite of the fact that the Chinese Communist government did not have a seat in the UN

at that time, this deplorable incident occurred. Now that the Chinese Communist government sits permanently on the Security Council, it is impossible to fend off the aggressive moves China is now making around the Senkaku Islands.

It is an indisputable fact that Tibet at the time of the aforementioned Chinese aggression was an independent state. During World War II, the Roosevelt administration asked the Tibetan government for permission to build a road from India to Chongqing via Tibet in order to supply arms to the Chiang Kai-shek government. The Tibetan government held a policy of neutrality throughout World War II and refused the request of the American government based on its policy. It was reportedly said that in Tibet, people prayed for Japanese victory while chanting Buddhist prayers. Tibet remained a neutral state, holding a Japan-friendly stance. Through these diplomatic exchanges, we know that America recognized Tibet as an independent state.

In 1946, the Tibetan government sent a diplomatic mission to the Allied Nations and also sent its delegation to the Asian Nations Conference held in India in 1947. On the occasion of India's independence, the Tibetan government sent its trade delegation to Britain, America, India and China. The Tibetan trade delegation entered each of the countries they visited using passport issued by the Tibetan government. In other words, these countries recognized Tibetan independence as fact. However, the Tibetan tragedy occurred.

Biased UN estranges Japan

There are countless instances that show how the UN and its specialized agencies have estranged Japan. A typical example is the absurdity and extreme enmity displayed against Japan in addressing the "comfort women" issue in the UN Human Rights Council and its predecessor, the UN Commission on Human Rights. As detailed reports have been made by those who actually attended meetings of the Human Rights Commission, I will not go into further detail here. Let me mention another self-evident example.

In August 1998, North Korea launched a *Tepodon* missile. The missile landed in the Pacific Ocean after passing over the Japanese Archipelagoes. Immediately, Japan worked on a resolution condemning North Korea, to be adopted in the UN Security Council. At that time, Japan was a non-permanent member of the UN Security Council. However, China opposed the resolution and it was never adopted. As a matter of fact,

Japan could not do so much as to present the resolution to the Council, let alone adopt it.

In April 2003, Japan worked with members of the UN Human Rights Commission to adopt a resolution condemning North Korea's human rights violations, including the abduction of Japanese citizens by North Korea. However, out of the then fifty-three member countries of the UN Human Rights Commission, ten countries, including China, opposed adopting the resolution and fourteen other countries, including India, abstained from voting.

In December 18, 2014, a resolution condemning North Korea's violation of human rights was adopted in the General Assembly with 116 votes for the resolution and 20 votes against, with 53 abstentions. Likewise, resolutions against North Korea have been adopted for ten years in a row. The fact is, however, that these resolutions were not legally binding whatsoever and have done nothing to solve issues like the North Korean abduction of Japanese citizens. Even for humanitarian issues like the abduction issue, the UN is utterly helpless in finding a solution.

Incidentally, every year, Japan contributes more than 10% of the UN's regular budget. In 2012, the United States contributed 22% of the total UN budget, while Japan contributed 12.5%. In 2013, the U.S. contribution was 22% and Japan's was 11%. Speaking in terms of sums, in 2013, the U.S. contributed ¥61.85 billion, with an exchange rate of 100 yen per dollar. Japan contributed approximately ¥27.6 billion. On the other hand, in 2013, China, a permanent member of the Security Council, contributed 5.1%, or a mere ¥13.1 billion.

One of the UN organs which obliges Japan to spend extravagantly is the UN University in Tokyo. I would like to discuss this matter on another occasion. By the way, Israeli Premier Netanyahu, who often becomes a target of harsh criticism in the UN Human Rights Council, angrily commented, "The Human Rights Council is a terrorist council." His anger is certainly reasonable. The Japanese surely understand his indignation, for we Japanese are constantly harried in the Human Rights Council whenever there is discussion on the "comfort women" issue.

Ban Ki-moon contributed to smashing the UN's vision

Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon is not very well regarded, both within and outside the

UN. Worse still, his anti-Japanese words and actions appeared in accordance with the domestic political climate in South Korea. At the very least, the UN Secretary-General ought to stand neutral, even from his native country. This man seems to be completely indifferent to shame or to his reputation and is a walking example of anti-Japanese South Korea, perfectly reflecting its harsh national anti-Japan sentiment. Being a country which contributes more than 10% of the UN budget, Japan should without hesitation protest to the Secretary-General. To our regret, the Japanese Foreign Ministry is not tough-minded enough to do so. It is time that we consider significantly reducing Japan's contribution to the UN.

From a different perspective, though, it could be said that Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon has contributed greatly to our national interest. That is, his anti-Japanese words and actions have been very helpful in breaking the illusionary faith Japanese people held toward the UN. Mr. Sato Ikuo, who served as Japan's Ambassador to the UN for four years, from 1998 to 2002, harshly criticizes the "UN-centered principle" still maintained by some Japanese. "Some people talk of a UN-centered principle, but if they mean to leave to the UN matters of great national concern, this is extremely risky and dangerous. Japan lacks the view that we should use the UN for the sake of our national interest. I shudder at the thought of discussing the UN as if it were divine."

Such a recognition of the UN should be shared by all of us Japanese.