



Written by [Alex Newman](#) on June 5, 2017

Published in the June 5, 2017 issue of [the New American](#) magazine. Vol. 33, No. 11

“Repeal and Replace” the UN: A False Solution

Even as the crimes and failures of the UN have become irrefutable, and its former defenders have taken to attacking it, globalists are pushing for its replacement, not its closing.



With the United Nations becoming increasingly controversial in the United States and beyond, the chorus to start dismantling it is growing louder and louder, and it is getting to be “mainstream.” Indeed, even many neoconservatives, perhaps hoping to keep what remains of their conservative credibility, appear to be joining the bandwagon. In recent years and especially in recent months, with the realization that more and more Americans are waking up to the evil of the UN, the calls for “replacing” the UN with some sort of “democratic” version of it are growing louder.

Writing in *National Review Online* after the British voted to secede from the European Union, for example, Josh Gelernter, also a regular contributor to the neocon journal *Weekly Standard*, headlined his article “Let’s Take a Cue From Brexit and Leave the U.N.” “There is no fixing the U.N.,” wrote Gelernter, urging readers to contact Congress and press the case. However, like other neocons, Gelernter went on to call for the creation of a “United Free Nations.”

Before that, Clifford May, the president of the neoconservative Foundation for Defense of Democracies and a signatory of the war mongering Project for a New American Century, made a similar argument in a late 2015 piece for the *Washington Times*. “The U.N. is not the headquarters of some notional ‘international community,’ and it’s certainly not the seed from which a global government should grow,” wrote May, who in the 1980s was reportedly listed as a member of the globalist Council on Foreign Relations. “The next administration might consider developing an alternative international organization, one that would include only nations sincerely committed to freedom, democracy, and human rights.”

As far back as 2012, Jonah Goldberg, the editor of *National Review*, an increasingly irrelevant propaganda organ for the neocon wing of the globalist establishment, made broadly the same argument. Outraged that the UN Security Council was able to block a resolution that would have led to regime change in Syria, Goldberg said it was time for a new organization. “What would be so terrible about giving those good nations someplace else to meet? By good, I mean democratic. A league, or concert, of democracies wouldn’t replace the United Nations, but it would offer some much-needed competition,” argued Goldberg, a “Never Trump” activist who was humiliated in the last election.

Goldberg actually used blatant falsehoods to promote his argument. “We have had to go around the United Nations before, and usually we go to NATO,” he wrote. “That was what President Clinton did in the Balkans and what President Obama did in Libya.” In fact, contrary to Goldberg’s inaccurate



Written by [Alex Newman](#) on June 5, 2017

Published in the June 5, 2017 issue of [the New American](#) magazine. Vol. 33, No. 11

assertion, nobody went “around” the UN — Obama specifically cited a UN Security Council resolution as his pretext for bombing Libya and overthrowing its government. Essentially, Goldberg and other warmongering neocons believe creating a new international organization would help provide a shred of legitimacy to their illegal wars and regime-change schemes.

Before those more recent calls, neocons such as U.S. Senator John McCain (R-Ariz.) made similar demands. During his 2008 presidential campaign, McCain — apparently unaware that the United States has always been a republic — pushed for the creation of a globalist body that would bring together “democracies.” “We have to strengthen our global alliances as the core of a new global compact — a League of Democracies — that can harness the vast influence of the more than one hundred democratic nations around the world to advance our values and defend our shared interests,” McCain declared.

But as *The New American’s* Patrick Krey wrote in 2009, McCain’s idea was hardly new — and it was hardly unique to the neocon wing of the globalist establishment. In fact, the “League of Democracies” was simply a slightly modified moniker for a similar scheme pushed by left-wing globalists known as the “Concert of Democracies.” That scheme was proposed in a 2006 report on national security for the “Princeton Project” by Anne-Marie Slaughter, a leftist advocate for the “New World Order” and the Obama-Hillary Clinton State Department’s director of policy planning at the time, as well as left-wing globalist Princeton Professor G. John Ikenberry. The proposed outfit would try to work within the UN, but if that failed, the alliance would assume many of its functions, including purporting to legitimize international military interventions demanded by the globalist establishment.

The year after Slaughter and Ikenberry called for a “Concert of Democracies,” Ivo Daalder, who was made a foreign policy advisor to Obama, co-wrote a 2007 piece published by *The American Interest* headlined “Democracies of the World, Unite!” In the piece, which seems to have pleased top-level globalists enough to give Daalder a massive career boost, the proposed global organization for “democracies” was painted as one that could push multiple globalist agendas successfully. “The Concert would be a vehicle for helping democracies confront their mutual security challenges,” they wrote. “This would involve close coordination of diplomatic strategy, law enforcement activity, intelligence collection and analysis, and military deployments. Over time, Concert members could follow NATO’s lead and develop common doctrine, promote joint training and planning, and enhance interoperability among their militaries, police forces and intelligence agencies.”

More recently, a similar idea has gained fresh momentum as the UN has become a pariah among U.S. voters and others around the world. As *The New American* reported online in February, a global effort dubbed “Covenant of Democratic Nations” was launched this year that seeks to abolish the United Nations. But instead of replacing it with nothing — after all, why would one want to replace a cancer with something else? — the widely ridiculed “dictators club” would be replaced with an international organization open exclusively to free and democratic nations.

Basically, it is a “repeal and replace” campaign to ostensibly protect the world from the UN and its increasingly vicious attacks on freedom and self-government. And who could be against that? A number of lawmakers around the world expressed interest in the campaign as the movement traveled from city to city hosting events to expose the UN and promote an alternative to it.

The Covenant of Democratic Nations held its “Global Launch” event in January on Capitol Hill. “The League of Nations outlived its usefulness during the Hitler regime,” read the invitation for the January



Written by [Alex Newman](#) on June 5, 2017

Published in the June 5, 2017 issue of [the New American](#) magazine. Vol. 33, No. 11

23 confab, held at the Rayburn House Office Building. “After the War, the League was replaced by the United Nations. Now the United Nations has outlived its usefulness and must be replaced with a new international body, one comprised solely of those nations governed by democratic principles, devoted to genuine democracy, equality, and peaceful relations throughout the world.”

“The United States should defund and withdraw from the United Nations and reconstitute the movement to achieve world peace for all in a new world body: The Covenant of Democratic Nations,” the campaign continued on its website and in various documents and invitations. “The Covenant of Democratic Nations will review, re-ratify, amend, or nullify all acts and resolutions of the United Nations and its agencies creating a new body of long-overdue, reformed, and updated international law.”

A number of prominent voices spoke at events the alliance organized in major cities across the United States. Among those in attendance at the “Global Launch” in Washington, D.C., was Representative Trent Franks (R-Ariz.). “This is a critically important issue,” explained Franks, who has an unimpressive 73 percent cumulative score on The New American’s Constitution-based Freedom Index. “The United Nations started out with a noble charter ... but the United Nations has not only failed their charter, they have distinctly moved in the opposite direction and done actual harm. They have become an anti-American, anti-Semitic, anti-democratic, anti-freedom mob. We need some type of alternative — a Covenant of Democratic Nations. We need to repeal and replace.”

On the campaign’s website, Franks is also quoted blasting the UN: “The United Nations is a proven failure and must be replaced.... An international body with the goal of promulgating global stability and protecting and promoting inalienable human rights and freedom in the world requires an entirely new institution. Founded by genuine democracies, limited to democracies, and devoted to democracy as the foundation for world peace, the Covenant of Democratic Nations would be able to succeed where the U.N. has failed.”

Lawmakers in other liberty-minded Western nations also joined the bandwagon. Australian Senator Malcolm Roberts with the anti-globalist One Nation party, for example, facilitated an event by the anti-UN group at the Australian Parliament. He said the UN was also a threat to his country. “This much is quite clear,” he said. “Australia’s values and way of life are also at risk from insidious institutions such as the unelected swill that is the United Nations. Action needs to be taken.”

Much of the rhetoric exposing the UN is very welcome — in fact, the movement’s delegitimizing of the UN is an enormously positive contribution. However, there are multiple problems with the idea. For instance, the Covenant of Democratic Nations campaign and many variations on it have touted “democracy” as the ideal to be pursued and the requirement for admission to the “new and improved” international organization that would replace or at least compete with the UN.

The Founders of the United States, though, explicitly rejected pure democracy as an unstable and dangerous system of government in which individual rights would not be adequately protected. Instead, they decided to establish a constitutional republic, governed by the rule of law and democratically elected representatives, in which the God-given rights of individuals would be protected.

In *The Federalist*, No. 10, James Madison, known as the “father” of the U.S. Constitution, made the point clearly, saying that democracies “have ever been spectacles of turbulence and contention; have ever been found incompatible with personal security or the rights of property; and have in general been



Written by [Alex Newman](#) on June 5, 2017

Published in the June 5, 2017 issue of [the New American](#) magazine. Vol. 33, No. 11

as short in their lives as they have been violent in their deaths.” To guard against such a system and its risks to life, liberty, and property, Madison advocated a republican form of government. “A republic, by which I mean a government in which the scheme of representation takes place, opens a different prospect, and promises the cure for which we are seeking,” he continued.

And of course, the Constitution he wrote made that explicit as well. In Article IV, Section 4, the U.S. Constitution mandates that the United States “guarantee to every State in this Union a Republican Form of Government.” Madison was not referring to the GOP, obviously, but to the system of government based on the rule of law to protect individual rights.

Beyond the Covenant of Democratic Nations are other schemes to replace the scandal-plagued UN with something else, often pushed, like the Concert of Democracies idea, by left-wing globalists. Billionaire Swedish-Hungarian investor Laszlo Szombatfalvy, for example, is offering \$5 million in prizes to whoever can invent a new UN-style organization to allegedly solve global problems better than the current scheme. “The biggest threats to humanity stem from the global community’s inability to deal with them effectively,” the Hungarian-born billionaire said in an interview with Swedish media. Szombatfalvy appears to be a fervent globalist, hoping the “UN 2.0” will impose a global “climate” regime and other radical schemes as part of what he touted as a new system of “global governance for the 21st century.”

The globalist establishment, being patient and clever, and trying to plan for various contingencies, may not seriously wish to abolish the UN and replace it with some sort of new global institution. However, the fact that the UN Security Council refused to go along with a few of the globalists’ proposed wars may have been enough to push them into the idea of creating an additional organization that would lend its seal of approval to additional regime-change schemes.

Additionally, if the UN becomes so discredited and delegitimized in the public mind that it can no longer serve its intended ultimate purpose — described by UN architect and U.S. Secretary of State John Foster Dulles as “world government” or “world federation” in his 1950 book *War or Peace* — it would be prudent for the globalist establishment to have a “Plan B,” so to speak. And of course, an organization that excluded mass-murdering dictatorships, unlike the UN, might have some additional legitimacy, at least with the segment of the world population still susceptible to globalist propaganda.



Written by [Alex Newman](#) on June 5, 2017

Published in the June 5, 2017 issue of [the New American](#) magazine. Vol. 33, No. 11

Subscribe to the New American

Get exclusive digital access to the most informative, non-partisan truthful news source for patriotic Americans!

Discover a refreshing blend of time-honored values, principles and insightful perspectives within the pages of "The New American" magazine. Delve into a world where tradition is the foundation, and exploration knows no bounds.

From politics and finance to foreign affairs, environment, culture, and technology, we bring you an unparalleled array of topics that matter most.



[Subscribe](#)

What's Included?

- 24 Issues Per Year
- Optional Print Edition
- Digital Edition Access
- Exclusive Subscriber Content
- Audio provided for all articles
- Unlimited access to past issues
- Coming Soon! Ad FREE
- 60-Day money back guarantee!
- Cancel anytime.