

ARTICLE APPEARED
ON PAGE 2-D

WASHINGTON TIMES
19 July 1985

Canadian envoy's U.N. fantasy

ARNOLD BEICHMAN

In Samuel Butler's satirical romance, *Erewhon*, (an anagram for nowhere), an educator in this mythical land describes how their system of education develops what he calls "the unreasoning faculties."

The teaching is done by a professor of inconsistency and a professor of evasion. Having listened to Stephen Lewis, Canadian Ambassador to the United Nations, deliver a hymn to the United Nations over Canadian Broadcasting Corp. on a recent Sunday, I would say that the Socialist diplomat (in what passes for Canada's Conservative government) is more than qualified to hold both professorial chairs, so highly developed are his "unreasoning faculties." In fact, he exemplifies a passage from Mr. Butler's novel: "It has been said that although God cannot alter the past, historians can."

The purpose of Ambassador Lewis's broadcast was to repeat once more his attack on the Heritage Foundation (although this time without naming any names), an influential research foundation which has been publishing devastating, eye-opening analyses of the work of the United Nations. He described the detractors of the United Nations as animated by "insular bunker mentalities."

Mr. Lewis blames the problems of the United Nations on the dropping of the bomb over Hiroshima by the United States. This event, which ended World War II, he says, foreshadowed the arms race, ideological polarization, the end of the U.S.

Soviet entente, and "the emergence of the super-powers in a way which would dominate and bedevil international politics for every decade to come."

So here we have an excellent example of what former Ambassador Jeane J. Kirkpatrick has called "moral equivalence," namely the left-liberal "impartial" view that it's a bipolar world, dominated entirely by the United States and the Soviet Union, with one as bad as the other, while the rest of the world sits helplessly by.

Omitted from Mr. Lewis's litany is any reference to the Baruch Plan whereby the United States offered to share its atomic secrets in the interests of international control. Josef Stalin rejected the Baruch Plan. Had he accepted it, it might today be a different world.

Mrs. Kirkpatrick rejected this bi-polar view of the world, the superpower rivalry image, because the United States "is not interested in expansion of any kind, nor any sort of territorial aggrandizement, nor do we seek to establish hegemony over other nations, or over the United Nations, nor do we see ourselves inside the United Nations as a leader of some team."

Canadian Ambassador Lewis utterly ignored the Soviet veto record at the United Nations, a record which includes the following recent events:

- In September 1983, the Soviet Union vetoed a resolution critical of the destruction by a Soviet fighter of a Korean Airlines passenger plane,

killing the 269 people aboard.

- In February 1984, the Soviet Union vetoed a draft resolution seeking to establish a U.N. force to bring peace to Lebanon.

Mr. Lewis utterly ignored the United Nations's refusal to legislate against international terrorism; its welcome to the U.N. rostrum of the gun-holstered Yasser Arafat; its designation of SWAPO, the terrorist organization, as the official representative of the Namibian people; or the U.N. General Assembly vote defining Zionism as racist, Nazi, fascist, and whatnot.

Ambassador Lewis seems to be unaware that the United Nations accepts the Soviet Union's definition of "national liberation movement." This means that the world organization legitimizes anti-colonial uprisings, never including countries such as Poland,

Czechoslovakia, or Hungary that oppose Soviet imperialism and that are occupied to this day by foreign troops, namely the Soviet Red Army.

It simply is not true, as Ambassador Lewis would have it, that the United Nations "unleashes its frustrations against both West and East with rhetorical regularity." Anyone who has covered U.N. General Assembly sessions knows that the attacks on the West, especially the United States, exceed exponentially what few muted criticisms of the

Soviet Union are ever heard. And why shouldn't it be that way? After all, of the 159 United Nations member states, the overwhelming majority are anti-democratic regimes whose elections are rigged to maintain a single party in power permanently.

Ambassador Lewis scoffed at criticisms which describe the U.N. Secretariat as "inefficient, corrupt,

illiterate, besotted by cronyism." Nonsense, said Ambassador Lewis, the U.N. Secretariat "is not better nor worse than most other international institutional arrangements."

In his assessment of the U.N. Secretariat, we have an example of either willful ignorance of the real issue, or blatant intellectual dishonesty. The gravamen of the indictment of the secretariat is the insertion of KGB operatives into the United Nations, its regional commissions and specialized agencies. Arkady Shevchenko, a Soviet defector who formerly was U.N. Undersecretary-General, has written that about half the Soviet nationals attached to U.N. headquarters in New York and the U.N. office in Geneva either are KGB agents or assigned to intelligence gathering. There have been innumerable cases of Soviet employees in the U.N. Secretariat apprehended for espionage.

Of 47 Soviet diplomats and officials expelled from France in April 1983 by the Mitterrand Socialist government, six worked in UNESCO. A large proportion of Soviet nationals accredited to the U.N. Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific are KGB intelligence collectors covering the ASEAN countries and Thailand. The Soviet Permanent Representative accredited to this U.N. body, Bosi Nikolayev, was named publicly in August 1983 as the head of the KGB in Bangkok.

I could go on with more, but is it conceivable that the Canadian ambassador to the United Nations is unaware of these irrefutable accusations against the UN Secretariat?

Ambassador Lewis argued that the United Nations serves a purpose in bringing together ideological opponents at least to talk to each other "on the principle that talking is infinitely better than shooting."

Continued

This supposedly unexceptionable statement was refuted by Dean Acheson, former U.S. secretary of state, who wrote in his memoirs:

"I have heard people who should know better . . . say happily, 'As long as we keep them talking, they're not fighting.' Nothing could be more untrue; they are fighting. They are adopting a tactic specifically prescribed by Lenin to delay the crises while demoralizing and weakening the enemy."

The ritualistic slogan, better talk than fight, was derided recently in the *American Spectator* by Vladimir Bukovsky, the Soviet dissident writer, who asked:

"Can anyone prove that to 'keep talking' is better than to 'quit talking?' Are there any facts to support this rule? Did anyone ever try not to 'keep talking?' Of course not. Unfortunately, this 'rule' is not simply a matter of innocent stupidity, for it implies, first of all, that the organic differences between democratic and totalitarian societies can be resolved by a negotiated settlement. This misleading notion misrepresents the East-West conflict as a sort of tragic misunderstanding that can be cleared up only if we 'engage in constructive dialogue,' 'try to understand each other,' 'sit down and talk,' or perform some other rite of liberal nonsense calculated to lay blame on the West for not trying to 'understand' the poor Soviets."

Wake up, Ambassador Lewis. You are or should be the Canadian Ambassador to the United Nations, not the U.N. Ambassador to Canada.

Arnold Beichman, visiting scholar at the Hoover Institution, is a former United Nations correspondent and author of The 'Other' State Department.