



Systemic Anti-Israel Bias in the United Nations Institu- tional Apparatus

Ran Bar-Yoshafat
Giulia Dal-Bello



Adar I 5782 – February 2022
Policy Paper no. 78

Attorney Ran Bar-Yoshafat

Deputy Director
of the Kohelet Policy Forum

Ran is active in the fields of constitutional and international law, and public diplomacy. Ran received a Law degree from the Hebrew University in Jerusalem, a Masters in Business from Tel-Aviv University, and a Masters in American Jewish History from Haifa University.



Giulia Dal-Bello

Researcher at Kohelet Policy Forum

Giulia Dal-Bello is a researcher in the fields of radicalization's processes, cognitive warfare and national security. Giulia holds a Bachelor Degree in Language, Culture and Societies of Asia and Mediterranean Africa from Cà Foscari, University of Venice, and a Masters in Palestine Studies from SOAS, University of London.



Systemic Anti-Israel Bias in the United Nations Institutional Apparatus

**Ran Bar-Yoshafat
Giulia Dal-Bello**



Adar I 5782 – February 2022
Policy Paper no. 78

Systemic Anti-Israel Bias in the United Nations Institutional Apparatus

Ran Bar-Yoshafat

Giulia Dal-Bello

Printed in Israel, February 2022

ISBN 978-965-7674-95-6

Throughout this report when the terms “Occupied Territories”, “Occupied Palestine”, “State of Palestine”, “West Bank” or “Palestine” are used, it is done to comply with the accepted international terminology and to exhibit the language used by the bodies being analyzed. This usage is not done to take a political stance or to show support for these labels. The usage of these terms whether in regard to a territory, people, or entity are for the express purpose of adhering to the international standard. This paper’s use of these terms is not to affirm or deny their accuracy or legality.



Table of Content:

Executive summary	1
Introduction — The United Nations.....	3
UN Special Rapporteur	5
Anti-Israel propaganda departments within the UN	9
Secretariat Bodies.....	11
Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People (CEIRPP), Division for Palestinian rights (DPR) and United Nations Information System on the Question of Palestine (UNISPAL)	13
CEIRPP	13
Division for Palestinian Rights (DPR)	18
United Nation Information System on the Question of Palestine (UNISPAL)	19
Conclusion	21



Executive Summary

This policy paper addresses systemic anti-Israel bias within the United Nations (UN) institutional apparatus. This bias manifests in a number of areas. First, the UN devotes a vastly disproportionate amount of attention towards Israel, and has issued more resolutions condemning Israel than all other countries combined. If that were not enough, several UN bodies actively spread false information against Israel. This is done under bodies that are allegedly working to promote the Palestinian cause. The Palestinians are the singular beneficiaries of several designated divisions within the UN organizational structure. For example, they are the only group to have a designated division within the UN's Department of Political and Peace-Building Affairs (DPPA) and Department of Political Affairs (DPA) (the 'Division for Palestinian Rights'). Similarly, within the Strategic Communications Division (SCD) of the Department of Global Communications (DGC) and Department of Public Information (DPI) operates the "Palestine, Decolonization and Human Rights Section." Another example is the UN General Assembly's Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People (CEIRPP) and its two divisions: the Division for Palestinian Rights (DPR) and the United Nations Information System on the Question of Palestine (UNISPAL). All of these bodies work to promote a one-sided agenda.

The phenomenon of multiple UN bodies advocating for a non-state actor at the expense of a full-fledged UN member state is unparalleled within the UN. In no other context are such a large number of UN bodies working to advance the agenda of a single group, whose activities are directed against a member state. As a result, negative campaigns targeting Israel are gaining momentum globally, in turn increasing pressure on the UN to continue its condemnation of Israel. As will be explained, in allowing for such internal bias, the UN continually violates its own rules. This policy paper exposes the magnitude of the UN's distorted and biased treatment of Israel.

Several UN bodies actively spread false information against Israel. This is done under bodies that are allegedly working to promote the Palestinian cause. The Palestinians are the singular beneficiaries of several designated divisions within the UN organizational structure.



Introduction — The United Nations

The United Nations was established by leading world powers in 1945 in response to the devastation and destruction of World War II, with the aim of preventing similar military conflicts. The UN, currently comprised of 193 member states and two non-member observer states (the Holy See and Palestine), is the largest and most powerful intergovernmental organization in the world. Its main offices are located in New York, Geneva, Nairobi, Vienna, and The Hague.

The ratification of the United Nations Charter in 1945 not only established the UN but also set out the rights, obligations, purposes, and principles of the organization and its member states. The UN's international character means its jurisdiction extends beyond a particular country, allowing it to take action globally on issues such as peace and security, climate change, human rights, disarmament, terrorism, and governance. The UN has five main purposes: maintaining international peace and security, protecting human rights, providing humanitarian aid, promoting sustainable development, and upholding international law. Among the most basic principles enshrined in the UN Charter are the principles of neutrality and equality between members.¹ Article 2 of the UN Charter states: "The Organization is based on the principle of the sovereign equality of all its Members."² Additionally, Article 100 states: "In the performance of their duties the Secretary-General and the staff shall not seek or receive instructions from any government or from any other authority external to the Organization. They shall refrain from any action which might reflect on their position as international officials responsible only to the Organization."³

Among the most basic principles enshrined in the UN Charter are the principles of neutrality and equality between members.



UN Special Rapporteur

The United Nations Human Rights Council (UNHRC) appoints a variety of country-specific and theme-specific Special Rapporteurs to investigate issues of human rights. One such Rapporteur is the UN Special Rapporteur on the Situation of Human Rights in the Palestinian Territories Occupied since 1967. The very title of this position testifies to an inherent bias against Israel. Appointees to this position have been systematically and vehemently critical of Israel, despite never voicing criticism of recognized terrorist organizations such as Hamas. In spite of their overt lack of neutrality, Special Rapporteurs are considered by the UN to be sufficiently objective to compose official UN reports on Israel.

This UN Special Rapporteur on the Palestinian Territories is the only Special Rapporteur designated to a non-state actor, criticizing a member state. Moreover, while the mandate of all other Special Rapporteurs is to improve the human rights situation within their assigned countries, that of the Special Rapporteur for the Palestinian Territories is to "...conduct country visits, investigate Israel's violations of the principles of international law and international humanitarian law, and receive communications from witnesses who have reliable and credible information."⁴ Whereas Special Rapporteurs usually oversee activities within their assigned countries, this is the sole instance in which a Special Rapporteur is tasked with investigating a different country (Israel). This mandate makes clear that the Special Rapporteur's goal is not to oversee Palestinian crimes, but solely to track Israel's "wrongdoings". A more accurate title would be "Special Rapporteur on Israel's Offences". In light of the Special Rapporteur's mandate, it is clear why there has never been any condemnation of the terrorist organization Hamas, among others. The UN does not blame Hamas. It blames Israel.⁵

The very title of this position testifies to an inherent bias against Israel. A more accurate title would be "Special Rapporteur on Israel's Offences." In light of the Special Rapporteur's mandate, it is clear why there has never been any condemnation of the terrorist organization Hamas, among others.

The Special Rapporteur's mandate only requires the investigation of possible Israeli human rights offenses, intentionally excluding those committed by the Palestinian Authority or Hamas.

Unlike other Special Rapporteurs, the Special Rapporteur for the Palestinian Territories has an ongoing mandate, scheduled to continue “until the end of the Israeli occupation”.⁶ The subtext is that the Special Rapporteur’s mandate will expire only when Israel withdraws from all disputed territories, meaning the area of Judea and Samaria, also known as the West Bank. This in and of itself constitutes an egregious violation of the UN Charter, which calls for neutrality and the equal treatment of all nations. Notably, while General Assembly (GA) resolutions have condemned Israel repeatedly, the UN Security Council has never called for full Israeli withdrawal. The Special Rapporteur’s term limit is an open rejection of the Jewish people’s historical and biblical ties to Judea and Samaria (the West Bank), the Jewish people’s status as an indigenous people, and its right to a national home, recognized by the UN’s predecessor, the League of Nations. Thus, this Special Rapporteur is not an impartial chronicler of human rights abuses. The Special Rapporteur’s mandate only requires the investigation of possible Israeli human rights offenses, intentionally excluding those committed by the Palestinian Authority or Hamas. Addressing the context behind alleged Israeli human rights violations is not required and thus remains wholly undocumented. Consequently, Special Rapporteur’s reports often read like a prosecutor’s indictment. If the position’s biased mission were not enough, Special Rapporteur appointees are themselves consistently biased, and are granted a stage and an international audience for their comments.

The nomination process for Special Rapporteurs, or ‘Special Procedures mandate-holders,’ is a competitive and transparent process involving an online written application, an interview and recommendations, which are submitted to the President of the Human Rights Council in the Council’s public report. The process is finalized when the selected candidate is appointed by the Human Rights Council.⁷ The nomination criteria are: (a) expertise; (b) experience in the field of the mandate; (c) independence; (d) **impartiality**; (e) personal integrity; and (f) **objectivity**. According to the stated criteria, individuals who may possess a conflict of interest related to the mandate should not be appointed to decision-making positions, yet this criteria is clearly not met by current Special Rapporteur Michael Lynk, who has been extremely critical of Israel and has even employed anti-Israel rhetoric in his criticism.⁸ His predecessor, Makarim Wibsono, accused Israel of using disproportionate force, minimized the number of Israeli civilian deaths caused by terrorism,

and excused terrorist attacks as a “flimsy pretext” for Israeli defensive action. Former Special Rapporteur Richard Falk published a blog post with a blatantly anti-Semitic illustration — a cartoon of a dog wearing a skullcap and a sweater that read “United State” — to illustrate his claim that Muammar Gaddafi’s indictment by the International Criminal Court stemmed from political motives.⁹

Given the one-sided nature of the mandate, only those with pre-existing anti-Israel bias would take this position, which is notably unpaid. As stated on the website of the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights (OCHR), “The special procedures of the Human Rights Council are independent human rights experts with mandates to report and advise on human rights from a thematic or country-specific perspective. They are non-paid and elected for 3-year mandates that can be re conducted for another three years.”¹⁰ However, the Rapporteurs do receive personnel and logistical support from the UN’s Human Rights Office and they may be supported by charities and corporations.

The first special Rapporteur, René Felber, who was appointed in 1993 and resigned in 1995, attempted to document potential human rights issues on both sides. He called for a review and reconsideration of the role of the Special Rapporteur “to enable him to make a more action-oriented contribution to the protection and promotion of human rights in the area.”¹¹ Unfortunately, this view was not held by future Rapporteurs.



Anti-Israel Propaganda Departments Within the UN

Despite the principles of neutrality and equality enshrined in the UN Charter, several UN bodies disregard these principles, displaying bias and outright hostility towards Israel.¹² Even more concerning, certain departments deliberately promote a one-sided agenda in favor of a single group. This involves selectively allocating funds to one group, verbally attacking the other and spreading information that is not only false, but that fundamentally undermines the principles embodied by the UN's very own founding document.

Various departments under the UN Secretariat are specifically devoted to advancing the Palestinian agenda. For example, the Department of Political and Peace-Building Affairs (DPPA) and the Department of Political Affairs (DPA) have a "Division for Palestinian Rights." Within the Strategic Communications Department of the Department of Global Communications (DGC) and the Department of Public Information (DPI) there is a "Palestine, Decolonization and Human Rights Section." The GA has a Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People (CEIRPP), with two subdivisions: the Division for Palestinian Rights (DPR) and the United Nations Information System on the Question of Palestine (UNISPAL). These agencies do not have special departments for other separatist causes, and certainly not for Israel.

All of these bodies promote a one-sided agenda that fails to demand accountability of the Palestinian Authority or Hamas for their offences. No other UN member state is the target of a systematic campaign endorsing its attackers. Those working to harm Israel use social media to promote a partial, often distorted perception of reality and to exert influence over other UN committees. Inevitably, these bodies' anti-Israel bias spills over into the organization more broadly. The Division for Palestinian Rights (DPR) and the Strategic Communications Division (SCD) "Palestine Sections" violate the

All of these bodies promote a one-sided agenda that fails to demand accountability of the Palestinian Authority or Hamas for their offences.

No other UN member state is the target of a systematic campaign endorsing its attackers.

above-cited clauses of the UN charter in several ways. First, by allocating disproportionate resources to the “Question of Palestine”, vital resources are withheld from peoples and states that are in greater or at least equal need. Second, this special treatment is blatantly unequal: the SCD’s only two location-based sections are devoted to Africa, an entire continent, and to ‘Palestine’, a tiny area associated with a group that is not even a UN member.



Secretariat Bodies

Though the Department of Political and Peace-Building Affairs (DPPA) has changed its focus several times, its primary fields of operation are Prevention and Mediation, Peacebuilding, Elections, Gender/Women, Peace and Security, Support to Member-State Bodies, Partnerships and Cooperation and Emerging Issues.¹³ The DPPA provides substantial support to member state bodies. As described on the UN website: “In carrying out its crucial functions, the United Nations Security Council relies on staff of the Department of Political and Peacebuilding Affairs (DPPA) for both substantive and secretariat support. DPPA provides similar staff support to two standing committees established by the General Assembly, concerning the Rights of the Palestinian People and Decolonization.”¹⁴

The Department of Global Communications (DGC) also has a section devoted to Palestine. Reporting to the Strategic Communications Division (SCD), the Palestine Decolonization and Human Rights Section is one of four sections comprising the SCD. According to the UN website, “The Palestine, Decolonization and Human Rights Section promotes the UN’s broad agenda on human rights, the rule of law, decolonization and indigenous peoples. It also carries out the Department’s special information program on the question of Palestine.”¹⁵ Devoting an entire section to promoting a specific people and its agenda contradicts Articles 2 and 100 of the UN Charter.

Devoting an entire section to promoting a specific people and its agenda contradicts Articles 2 and 100 of the UN Charter.



Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People (CEIRPP), Division for Palestinian Rights (DPR) and United Nations Information System on the Question of Palestine (UNISPAL)

CEIRPP

The Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People (CEIRPP) is a body within the UN uniquely devoted to the “question of Palestine”. It was established in 1975 by General Assembly Resolution 3376 and tasked with promoting Palestinian self-determination without external interference, promoting Palestinian national independence and sovereignty, and enabling the return of Palestinian refugees to the territories from which they had been displaced. The aim of the CEIRPP is stipulated in General Assembly Resolution 3236:

“The General Assembly,

1. *Reaffirms* the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people in Palestine, including:
 - 1.(a) The right to self-determination without external interference;
 - 2.(b) The right to national independence and sovereignty;

CEIRPP's reports and presentations employ anti-Israel terminology, expressions and audiovisual tools.

2. *Reaffirms* also the inalienable right of the Palestinians to return to their homes and property from which they have been displaced and uprooted, and, calls for their return.”¹⁶

The mandate of the CEIRPP has been renewed annually, continually increasing advocacy and mobilization for the Palestinian cause.

The CEIRPP's reports and bulletins demonstrate partiality and bias against Israel in three main areas. First, CEIRPP's reports and presentations employ anti-Israel terminology, expressions and audiovisual tools. Such expressions implicitly hold Israel responsible for violent activity, and incorporate audiovisual elements in which maps of Israel, the West Bank and Gaza are labeled “map of Palestine.” These biased forms of expression are not only used by UN bodies, but are adopted and used in external events supported by international NGOs and global civil society. Bias towards Israel is thus imprinted in the materials used and disseminated by CEIRPP.

Secondly, the negation of the Israeli perspective and the granting of the “right of return” to Palestinian refugees and their descendants is clearly one-sided and ignores previous attempts at reconciliation. The “right of return” claimed by the Committee is a contentious issue that the parties have agreed to discuss in peace-talks. For example, there is disagreement surrounding the question of whether the status of a ‘Palestinian refugee’ can be passed on from generation to generation (a claim that is unique to Palestinian refugees). Today, there are more than five million claims for Palestinian refugees, with numbers steadily growing.¹⁷ Clearly, the “right of return” is an extremely delicate issue which can only be resolved by political agreement. In acquiescing to the CEIRPP's advocacy for the return of the Palestinian refugees, the UN has taken a stand against Israel's interest.

The third problematic area of the CEIRPP's work is its use of soft power in order to covertly promote its agenda. The CEIRPP indirectly supports anti-Israel campaigns such as the Boycott, Divestment and Sanctions movement (BDS), a global movement of non-governmental organizations, unions, academic associations, and activists that has infiltrated the political and public discourse to isolate Israel in the economic, political and cultural international arena. Thanks to their status within certain United Nations' bodies, NGOs and other civil society groups have obtained great support and legitimacy from the broader UN system, which, on several occasions, has sponsored pro-BDS activities.

An analysis of CEIRPP annual reports from 2018 to 2020 reveals a consistent pattern of vilification of Israel, exemplified by the recurring use of biased language.¹⁸ The use of such terminology demonstrates the CEIRPP's active and uncompromising support of the

Palestinians and its total disregard for the Israeli perspective. The use of such language by the CEIRPP cannot be justified as typical of UN rhetoric when addressing disputed land. In fact, it is impossible to draw a comparison between UN rhetoric vis-à-vis the Israeli-Palestinian case versus other “occupations” such as that in Western Sahara, North Cyprus and Ukrainian Crimea, because the number of reports, resolutions and bodies devoted to the Palestinians far surpasses those devoted to other cases. The only commonality between these cases is the use of the word “occupied”, though it is applied far more to the Palestinian territories than to the other cases of “occupation.”

Moreover, the latest CEIRPP reports reveal an evolution in both the terminology used to refer to Israel and its frequency. There has been a notable shift from the descriptive language used in the CEIRPP’s 2018¹⁹ report — “Israel, **as** an occupying power” — to the designation applied by the GA — “Israel, **the** occupying Power.” This shift has categorically equated Israel with “the occupying power.” Whereas the phrase “Israel as an occupying power” is used three times in CEIRPP’s 2018 report, the more explicit designation — “Israel, the occupying Power” — dominates the 2019 and 2020 reports. The capitalization of the letter P in “power” further implicates Israel, treating it as the responsible party whose actions must be monitored.²⁰ The CEIRPP’s choice of language demonstrates its commitment to a biased, one-dimensional narrative, also exemplified by the utilization of Muslim terminology alone to refer to holy sites of deep historical and religious significance to Judaism and the Jewish people.

For example, by referring to the Temple Mount only by its Arabic name, Haram al-Sharif, the CEIRPP undermines and ignores Jewish links to this central religious site.²¹ Additionally, the repeated use of the word “Nakba”, Arabic for “catastrophe”, to describe the events of 1948, accounts only for the Palestinian’s perspective of the events of that year, once again ignoring the Israeli perspective.²²

Furthermore, the CEIRPP reports consistently employ biased language that exposes a double standard. For example, a 2020 report contains the following description: “The threat of conflict has persisted, as tensions and the cycle of violence between the two sides has remained inflamed. Israeli forces continued to carry out daily military raids and to perpetrate acts of violence against the Palestinian civilian population under occupation. In mid-November 2019, rockets were fired from the Gaza Strip into Israel, followed by Israel Defense Forces military strikes, two days after Israel and Palestinian Islamic Jihad had agreed to an Egyptian-mediated ceasefire.”²³ Thus, rockets fired from Gaza are presented merely as a response to IDF strikes, rather than as a unilateral attack on civilians.

By referring to the Temple Mount only by its Arabic name, Haram al-Sharif, the CEIRPP undermines and ignores Jewish links to this central religious site.

Additionally, in this report as well as a 2018 report, although mention is made of the Palestinian Islamic Jihad and Hamas, the terms “terrorism” and “terrorist organization” are glaringly absent. The 2018 report states: “On 12 October 2017, with the support of Egypt, Fatah and Hamas signed an agreement to enable the Government of the State of Palestine to resume its responsibilities in Gaza.”²⁴ This omission is not coincidental and is evidence of the double standard embraced and promulgated by the CEIRPP: while Hamas and the Palestinian Islamic Jihad are not coined terrorist organizations, Israel is repeatedly described as the occupying power.

The following quotes from CEIRPP reports further demonstrate the committee’s trajectory of vilifying and blaming Israel.

- “(...) 52-year Israeli occupation of the Palestinian territory, including East Jerusalem, and diminishing prospects for realizing the two-State solution and a just peace.”²⁵
- “The Committee reiterates the need to reframe the Palestinian-Israeli conflict. It is not a conflict between two equal parties over disputed territory. It is a conflict emanating from one State occupying, colonizing and annexing the territory of another State under oppressive, inhumane and discriminatory conditions.”²⁶
- “The Committee deplores the use of excessive, disproportionate and indiscriminate force by Israeli forces against Palestinian civilians (...).”²⁷
- “Palestine refugees should be treated as dispossessed nationals of a country — the State of Palestine — rather than as stateless refugees. It strongly advocates the right to return as well as just compensation for Palestine refugees.”²⁸
- “The annual exhibition organized by the Committee on the occasion of the International Day of Solidarity with the Palestinian People, in cooperation with the Permanent Observer Mission of the State of Palestine to the United Nations, was entitled ‘Palestine: the most universal national cause.’”²⁹
- “(...) the need for the international community to acknowledge the Nakbah and to hold Israel accountable for crimes committed in 1948 and thereafter; the need to establish a truth-seeking, reparations and reconciliation mechanism prior to a political agreement; the need to remind Israel of its obligations under international law and to request that it provide better international protection to Palestinians, including refugees; and the need to treat Palestine refugees as dispossessed nationals of a country — Palestine — rather than as stateless refugees.”³⁰

- “(...) Israeli reluctance to recognize the Palestinian people as an equal has resulted in a colonizer/colonized power dynamic between the two peoples.”³¹

The CEIRPP, in collaboration with the Division of Palestinian Rights (DPR), promotes such a narrative not only within the UN system, but also at a multitude of conferences and events taking place worldwide throughout the year. The most striking example is the CEIRPP event known as the “International Day of Solidarity with the Palestinian People”, held annually on November 29th, in commemoration of the date of the 1947 UN vote on the partition of Palestine.³² The event, organized in collaboration with the Permanent Observer Mission of Palestine to the U.N., was first observed in 1977. The event includes the screening of Palestinian films, art exhibits, and panel speaker events, and consistently depicts the Israeli-Palestinian conflict from an exclusively Palestinian perspective, portraying Israel as the ultimate offender. At one such event, UN Secretary General Kofi Annan, together with the President of the GA and the President of the Security Council, took part in a panel discussion displaying a map of Israel, West Bank and Gaza entitled “Map of Palestine.”³³

Most of the speakers at this event freely utilize biased terminology used by the CEIRPP, such as “occupying Power” and “Nakba”. Some of the CEIRPP’s members go further, describing Israel as a colonial power and comparing the Israeli administration of certain areas of the West Bank to an apartheid regime.³⁴ One speaker, the Chair of the Coordinating Bureau of the Non-Aligned Movement, harshly criticized Israel and its military deployment, describing Israel as brutal and deplorable for targeting “defenseless”, “innocent” and “heroic” Palestinians.³⁵ While participants are entitled to their point of view, it is unacceptable that such declarations are allowed to be made at the UN headquarters in New York without affording Israel any opportunity to respond to these accusations nor taking the Israeli perspective into account.

Furthermore, in its 2018 annual report, the CEIRPP called upon the international community “to shift from a humanitarian to a political and a human rights framework in addressing the plight of the Palestinian people”.³⁶ Shifting from a humanitarian to a human rights legal framework has veiled but significant legal consequences. The fundamental difference between International Human Rights Law and International Humanitarian Law (IHL) is that IHRL does not allow for the military and security considerations that can be cited under IHL.³⁷ The shift from IHL to IHRL inevitably places weighty legal burdens on the “occupying power”.³⁸ The Israeli-Palestinian conflict constitutes a struggle between two entities, each striving to fulfill their political aims. The CEIRPP is advocating to change the

The shift from IHL to IHRL inevitably places weighty legal burdens on the “occupying power.”
Applying IHRL to the conflict, as called for by the CEIRPP, would limit Israel’s right to self-defense from Palestinian terrorism.

These activities eventually became a part of the Boycott, Divestment and Sanctions (BDS) campaign. The DPR is part of the UN Secretariat's Department of Political and Peacebuilding Affairs (DPPA), and is the only one of its five divisions uniquely devoted to a specific population.

legal paradigm by applying international human rights law (IHRL) to the conflict during both peacetime and armed conflict, although such legal framework is generally reserved for and applied during armed conflict only. Within this new IHRL legal framework, the two entities would not share responsibility for the conflict, but instead, one would be the aggressor and the other the victim. The legal ramifications of such a paradigm shift are such that Israel's actions would not be recognized as self-defense but rather as acts of aggressions against the Palestinians. In sum, applying IHRL to the conflict, as called for by the CEIRPP, would limit Israel's right to self-defense from Palestinian terrorism.³⁹

Division for Palestinian Rights (DPR)

The GA mandated the establishment of the Division for Palestinian Rights (DPR) through Resolution 32/40 to help inform public opinion on the Palestinian issue through conferences, workshops and events such as the "International Day in Solidarity with the Palestinian People." These activities eventually became a part of the Boycott, Divestment and Sanctions (BDS) campaign. The DPR is part of the UN Secretariat's Department of Political and Peacebuilding Affairs (DPPA), and is the only one of its five divisions uniquely devoted to a specific population. If all members are meant to be treated equally under the UN Charter, it is puzzling that the DPR is the only division under the Secretariat devoted to a specific populace.

Like the CEIRPP, the DPR has adopted a double standard with respect to the conflict. For example, a General Assembly resolution passed in 2020 reads: "The DPR continues to make a constructive and positive contribution to raising awareness of the question of Palestine in all aspects on the basis of international law and UN resolutions and the efforts being exerted in this regard and to generating International support for the rights of the Palestinian people."⁴⁰ In contrast, no department within the UN, let alone within the Secretariat, is solely dedicated to advancing Israel's perspective or raising awareness on calls for Israel's destruction by Palestinian and Middle Eastern countries and organizations. This double standard and anti-Israel bias fundamentally contradicts the principle of equality embodied by the UN Charter. Furthermore, while the General Assembly felt the need to inform global public opinion on the "inalienable rights" of the Palestinians, it did not act similarly on behalf of any other stateless or marginalized ethnic group, such as the Kurds, the Sahrawis, the Igbo, or the Yorubas.

United Nation Information System on the Question of Palestine (UNISPAL)

Another platform utilized by the UN to condemn Israel is the UN Information System on the Question of Palestine (UNISPAL), a website providing access to a vast collection of resolutions, documents and maps in support of the Palestinian cause. Although it is clearly inappropriate for the UN to pick sides on a highly contested issue, nor to broadcast its one-sided position on its official website, this has not stopped the Division of Palestinian Rights from publishing legal, political and economic studies on “the question of Palestine” on the UNISPAL website. The UNISPAL website also advertises pro-Palestinian conferences, including the “International Conference on the Question of Jerusalem — Annexation in practice — Palestinian lives in Jerusalem”, “International Parliamentarians and the Palestine Question” and “The Covid-19 Pandemic under occupation — national resilience and international support.”⁴¹

UNISPAL's collection of documents are a vehicle for disseminating biased information against Israel, in violation of the UN's professed non-partisan nature. This collection includes a document entitled “Origins and Evolution of the Palestinian Problem”, which stresses the “national identity and rights of the Palestinian people” and presents a partisan narrative of events. For example, though the paper makes repeated mention of the Sabra and Shatila massacres, it never explicitly points out that the massacres were carried out by Christian Lebanese militiamen. Rather, in mentioning Israel alongside the massacres, the paper implies that Israel is the true culprit, promoting an ideologically-charged narrative: “The gravity of the Palestinian question has reached new heights as a result of the Israeli invasion of Lebanon, the Sabra and Shatila massacres and the creeping annexation of the West Bank.”⁴²

Finally, the UN's pro-Palestinian and anti-Israel campaign is not limited to the written or spoken word, and includes visual propaganda. It has been said that the invention of the camera has provided the world a window into the truth. However, the photographer can easily manipulate the frame to alter or distort the perception of reality, in order to inspire a particular feeling or view or advance a specific agenda. Because images profoundly affect the perception of reality, they have become potent tools in influencing and manipulating public opinion, particularly in the context of social justice.

UNISPAL's collection of documents are a vehicle for disseminating biased information against Israel, in violation of the UN's professed non-partisan nature.

The CEIRPP and its related entities, namely the DPR and the DGC, have great influence within the UN, thus undermining the neutrality of the entire organization. Their lack of impartiality, failure to remain apolitical, and active efforts to foster a one-sided narrative and political agenda are in violation of the UN Charter, a legally binding instrument of international law. This one-sided narrative is promoted by UN bodies via social media.⁴³



Conclusion

The UN is the world's largest international organization. It plays a significant role in maintaining peace, assisting distressed populations, and addressing other worthy goals aimed at advancing humanity. However, in practice, the UN promotes a one-sided agenda on behalf of a particular group and at the expense of a member state, in contravention of the UN Charter. Both Israel and the Palestinians receive unbalanced treatment from the UN: Israel is the target of endless condemnation, misinformation, biased treatment, hostile decisions and negative coverage. The Palestinians, on the other hand, are showered with support: their agenda is advanced to a degree unparalleled by any other group, they are portrayed as the most vulnerable group in the world (a claim not backed by UN data or any objective index), and various UN bodies actively promote pro-Palestinian propaganda.

This unequal treatment is carried out by the UN Special Rapporteur on the Situation of Human Rights in the Palestinian Territories Occupied since 1967, a position whose very title demonstrates bias, in contravention of the UN Charter. Such treatment is furthered by a number of UN bodies that, while distinct from one another, share a common bias in favor of a non-member group (Palestinians) and a common hostility towards Israel.

The current state of affairs, in which UN bodies allocate a disproportionate share of their budgets to the Palestinians and engage in propaganda on their behalf, violates the UN's ideal of equality and fair treatment of all. Not only are Palestinians granted preferential treatment that far surpasses the assistance provided to other vulnerable groups, Israel's interests are directly harmed, despite its being a UN member state. Israel's very legitimacy and status are undermined and its reputation blackened. The UN's pervasive anti-Israel agenda influences how Israel is perceived by the interna-

The allegedly objective interpretations of international law endorsed by UN bodies are motivated by prejudice rather than facts. Only by exposing and immediately halting this pattern of deliberate bias will it be possible to establish a fair playing field for Israel and, crucially, to restore confidence in the UN.

tional community. The allegedly objective interpretations of international law endorsed by UN bodies are motivated by prejudice rather than facts, and go so far as to change norms of international law in an attempt to harm Israel. Only by exposing and immediately halting this pattern of deliberate bias will it be possible to establish a fair playing field for Israel and, crucially, to restore confidence in the UN.



Endnotes

- 1 <https://www.un.org/en/about-us/main-bodies>.
- 2 <https://www.un.org/en/about-us/un-charter/full-text>
- 3 Ibid., emphasized by the author.
- 4 <https://ijrcenter.org/un-special-procedures/list-of-country-specific-special-procedures/>.
- 5 <https://news.un.org/en/story/2018/12/1027881>.
- 6 <https://spinternet.ohchr.org/ViewAllCountryMandates.aspx?lang=en>.
- 7 <https://www.ohchr.org/EN/HRBodies/HRC/SP/Pages/Nominations.aspx>.
- 8 <https://www.ngo-monitor.org/reports/special-rapporteur-human-rights-palestinian-territory/>.
- 9 <https://www.jpost.com/International/UNs-Richard-Falk-under-fire-for-anti-Semitic-cartoon>
- 10 <https://www.ohchr.org/EN/HRBodies/SP/Pages/Welcomepage.aspx>
- 11 <http://hrlibrary.umn.edu/commission/country52/18-pal.htm>
- 12 https://en.kohelet.org.il/wp-content/uploads/2019/01/KPF089_UN_030119_web_R.pdf.
- 13 <https://dppa.un.org/en/what-we-do>.
- 14 <https://dppa.un.org/en/support-to-member-state-bodies>
- 15 <https://www.un.org/en/department-global-communications/spotlighting-issues>.
- 16 [https://undocs.org/A/RES/3236\(XXIX\)](https://undocs.org/A/RES/3236(XXIX))
- 17 https://www.unrwa.org/sites/default/files/content/resources/unrwa_in_figures_2021_eng.pdf
- 18 <https://www.un.org/unispal/document/2018-annual-report-of-palestinian-rights-committee-to-un-general-assembly-a7335/>.
- 19 CEIRPP, 2018, p.11 <https://www.un.org/unispal/document/2018-annual-report-of-palestinian-rights-committee-to-un-general-assembly-a7335/>
- 20 CEIRPP, 2020, p.6 <https://www.un.org/unispal/document/2020-annual-report-of-committee-on-the-exercise-of-the-inalienable-rights-of-the-palestinian-people-to-the-un-general-assembly-a-75-35/>.
- 21 CEIRPP, 2020, p.7 <https://www.un.org/unispal/document/2020-annual-report-of-committee-on-the-exercise-of-the-inalienable-rights-of-the-palestinian-people-to-the-un-general-assembly-a-75-35/>.
- 22 CEIRPP, 2019, p.8, p.21, p.22 <https://www.un.org/unispal/document/2019-annual-report-of-committee-on-the-exercise-of-the-inalienable-rights-of-the-palestinian-people-to-un-general-assembly-advance-edited-version/>
- 23 CEIRPP, 2020, p.7 <https://www.un.org/unispal/document/2020-annual-report-of-committee-on-the-exercise-of-the-inalienable-rights-of-the-palestinian-people-to-the-un-general-assembly-a-75-35/>

- 24 CEIRPP, 2018, p.8 <https://www.un.org/unispal/document/2018-annual-report-of-palestinian-rights-committee-to-un-general-assembly-a7335/>.
- 25 CEIRPP, 2019, p.6 <https://www.un.org/unispal/document/2019-annual-report-of-committee-on-the-exercise-of-the-inalienable-rights-of-the-palestinian-people-to-un-general-assembly-advance-edited-version/>.
- 26 Ibid. p. 21
- 27 Ibid. p. 22.
- 28 Ibid. p.22
- 29 CEIRPP, 2020, p. 16 <https://www.un.org/unispal/document/2020-annual-report-of-committee-on-the-exercise-of-the-inalienable-rights-of-the-palestinian-people-to-the-un-general-assembly-a-75-35/>
- 30 CEIRPP, 2018, p. 21 <https://www.un.org/unispal/document/2018-annual-report-of-palestinian-rights-committee-to-un-general-assembly-a7335/>
- 31 Ibid. p. 23
- 32 In accordance with General Assembly resolution 60/73 of December 1, 2005.
- 33 ADL, 2009, p.16 <https://www.adl.org/sites/default/files/documents/israel-international/un-international-organizations/c/CEIRPP-FINAL-REPORT-2009.pdf>.
- 34 <https://www.un.org/unispal/wp-content/uploads/2018/08/State-of-Palestine-Statement-pdf> p.4
- 35 <https://www.un.org/unispal/wp-content/uploads/2018/08/NAM-Message-and-NV.pdf>
- 36 <https://www.un.org/unispal/document/2018-annual-report-of-palestinian-rights-committee-to-un-general-assembly-a7335/>.
- 37 A. Roberts, 'What is a Military Occupation?', (1984) 55 British Yearbook of International Law, no. 1, pp. 243-305, 300.
- 38 Y. Arai, The Law of Occupation: Continuity and Change of International Humanitarian Law, and its Interaction with International Human Rights Law (2009), pp. 8-9.
- 39 E. Benvenist, 'Occupation, Belligerent', in Max Planck Encyclopedia of Public International Law [MPEPIL] (online ed.), para. 32.
- 40 <https://www.un.org/unispal/document/compilation-of-un-resolutions-and-decisions-adopted-in-2020-dpr-publication-a-ac-183-l-2-add-42/> (p-4).
- 41 <https://www.un.org/unispal/events/list/page/3/?eventDisplay=past>.
- 42 <https://www.un.org/unispal/document/auto-insert-194541/>.
- 43 <https://www.facebook.com/UN.palestinianrights/>.

KOHELET POLICY FORUM

The Kohelet Policy Forum in Jerusalem strives to secure the future of Israel as the nation-state of the Jewish People, to strengthen Israeli democracy, expand individual liberty, and deepen free market principles in Israel. The Forum is a non-partisan entity. It relies on private donations and does not accept, directly or indirectly, public funds from any government, domestic or foreign. The Forum's legislative research, policy papers, and other research-based products are offered to Israeli decision-makers and to the public free of charge.



KOHELET POLICY FORUM

Am V'Olam 8
Jerusalem 9546306

Tel 02-6312720
Fax 02-6312724

office@kohelet.org.il
www.kohelet.org.il

ISBN 978-965-7674-95-6



9 789657 674956