

China Denounces UN Security Council's Promotion of the West's Political Agenda in Myanmar

October 24, 2018 at 3PM

By [Carla Stea](#)

Global Research, November 25, 2018

Region: [Asia](#)

Theme: [United Nations](#)

Although China's statements at the UN Security Council are most often brief and general in content, the afternoon of October 24 China's Ambassador Ma spoke at length and brilliantly exposed the fraudulent use of "concern for human rights" to conceal the manipulation and abuse of the Security Council to facilitate the political agenda of western imperial interests.

"The International community should devote more attention to helping local authorities and residents eradicate poverty, achieve sustainable development, improve their livelihoods and social and economic conditions, and foster social stability and harmonious coexistence among the people.....

With regard to the report of the independent international fact-finding mission on Myanmar (A/HRC/39/64), the mission did not enter in Myanmar at all. Its results are based on biased, incomplete information. They are neither objective nor impartial, and therefore not credible. Its conclusions, suggestions and recommendations constitute willful interference in Myanmar's internal affairs and are an affront to its sovereignty. The fact-finding mission is not judge. Such practices are unhelpful to resolving the issue in Rakhine state and can only jeopardize the possibility of internal reconciliation and democratic transition in Myanmar, escalate tensions in Rakhine state and undermine the authority and credibility of the United Nations."

Russian Ambassador Nebenzia stated:

"As for the joint letter to the President of the Security Council from nine member states requesting the holding of this briefing, in our view its very form is what might be termed an innovation in the work of the Security Council. To say it like it is, this is nothing but arm-twisting, in which the authors of the letter show the rest of us that the potential result of a procedural vote on it is for all practical purposes predetermined....The United States delegation, which actively supported the holding of today's briefing by issuing an invitation to the Human Rights Council briefer, recently announced that it was leaving the Human Rights Council and accompanied the announcement with a good deal of criticism of it. But now it turns out that the Human Rights Council is useful after all. Is not clearly a double standard? We believe that the work of the fact-finding mission on Myanmar is harmful and counterproductive. It does not have reliable information on what is going on with the Rohingya...In view of the foregoing, therefore, we believe that the report of the Mission is underprepared and one-sided, and the notion of chucking its so-called conclusions at the Security Council is overtly pernicious."

Following the vote, Ambassador Nebenzia stated:

“After today’s meeting, no one should be left with any illusions about the fact that its instigators have absolutely no interest in resolving the problems of the Rohingya. They are merely an excuse for putting shameless pressure on the authorities of a sovereign State and forcing it to do what its former colonizer and its allies want. The logical next step in that direction would be pressure for anti-Myanmar sanctions and corresponding Security Council resolutions, a course of action that we categorically refuse to support. “

Though China and Russia fiercely and eloquently oppose the inclusion of Mr. Marzuki Darusman’s report in the Security Council agenda, this very contentious issue during the Security Council meeting has a precedent, and a nefarious precedent, again involving a presentation in which Mr. Darusman was a participant, the infamous “Kirby Report” the “Commission of Inquiry,” which China presciently opposed including in the agenda of the Security Council: the situation of human rights in the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, which was taken up on December 22, 2014. At that time China stated:

“The Security Council is not a forum designed for involvement in human rights issues, and still less should human rights issues be politicized....The Security Council’s inclusion of the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea situation on its agenda in order to involve itself of the situation of human rights in that country will work against those goals and can only do harm rather than good.”

It is unfortunate that Russia and China did not act more forcefully to veto the sanctions against the DPRK, as both countries were aware of the duplicity and double standards underlying those sanctions, imposed by countries whose record of human rights violations are so abhorrent that they themselves should be sanctioned accordingly. And a Russian-Chinese veto of those savage sanctions would have prevented the hellish outcome today where the so-called “humanitarian exemptions” are brazenly and promiscuously ignored, violated, and the sanctions are sadistically tightened with the ultimate purpose of strangling a heroic and intellectually and morally advanced people, who should be regarded as a model of social and economic development. Instead, North Korea is portrayed as a pariah, and the virtually impenetrable propaganda perpetrated by the major media organizations of the West have used this falsification to manipulate public support for crushing the DPRK.

It is interesting that Darusman’s name appears both as the advocate of a bigoted account based on ignorance of the reality within Myanmar, having never actually set foot within the country, and the infamous “Commission of Inquiry” report on the DPRK, in which Darusman also participated, is based, equally on the most scandalously distorted propaganda and ignorance, as neither Michael Kirby, nor the other names associated with that intellectually slothful report have never set foot in the DPRK.

The Kirby report is predominantly based on the highly paid fabrications of the defector Shin Dong-hyuk, who subsequently admitted he had lied and falsified his statements (though he never repaid the huge sums of money he was paid for those lies, which gave birth to the grotesque falsifications of the Kirby report). Indeed, this fabrication was so disgraceful that the defector community itself disavowed them. Numerous other highly paid defectors disgorged salacious and gruesome fabrications, the more gruesome the more lucrative.

In contrast to Kirby and Darusman, I, myself was physically present in the DPRK during May, 2017, and I saw zero evidence of human rights abuses. Nevertheless, during the time I was actually, personally in the DPRK, I was told by the director of an important Canadian human rights organization that the Kirby report is a malignancy which is impeding human rights efforts and humanitarian aid to North Korea. But, of course, that is precisely the intent of the sponsors of the UN "Commission of Inquiry." It requires repeating that at the stake-out following the iniquitous December 22, 2014 meeting of the Security Council, UN Human Rights coordinator Ivan Simonovic was asked by reporter and attorney Joseph Klein whether the Kirby report met the standard of proof required for admission in a court of law. Mr. Simonovic stated that he had "mixed feelings" about the entire matter, and that "the threshold used by the Kirby report Commission of Inquiry does NOT meet the threshold of solid evidence required for admission as evidence in a court of law." In short, the Kirby report, the UN "Commission of Inquiry" is not based on fact and could not be presented as evidence in a legitimate court of law.

It is imperative to ask who was the midwife of the Arakan Rohingya Salvation Army which has been involved in terrorist actions in Myanmar, contributing to the current crisis. Did they appear out of nowhere, or did they have sponsors outside of Myanmar? According to a report from Al Jazeera," the group may be receiving funds from the Rohingya diaspora in Saudi Arabia."

China's Ambassador Ma further explained his fierce, eloquent opposition to the October 24 Security Council meeting, stating:

"By receiving a briefing from the Fact-Finding Mission, the Security Council will encroach on the mandates of the General Assembly, the Human Rights Council, violate provisions of the Charter and weaken the responsibilities and roles of various United Nations bodies, thereby leading to grave negative consequences. When it comes to the issue of Rakhine state, the Security Council should play a constructive role, and any action it takes should help to resolve the issue. Pushing for a briefing by the Human Rights Council's fact-finding mission in the Security Council will disrupt and undermine the ongoing dialogue process. It does not help to resolve the issue of Rakhine state but will further complicate it, running counter to the process of finding a settlement. That is why we are opposed to having this meeting and hearing this briefing."

And that may be precisely the reason why the meeting was so aggressively promoted by certain members of the Security Council.

*

Note to readers: please click the share buttons above. Forward this article to your email lists. Crosspost on your blog site, internet forums. etc.

Carla Stea is Global Research's correspondent at the United Nations Headquarters, New York, N.Y.

The original source of this article is Global Research
Copyright © [Carla Stea](#), Global Research, 2018

[Comment on Global Research Articles on our Facebook page](#)

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: [Carla Stea](#)

About the author:

Author and Geopolitical analyst Carla Stea is Global Research's Correspondent at United Nations headquarters, New York, NY.

Disclaimer: The contents of this article are of sole responsibility of the author(s). The Centre for Research on Globalization will not be responsible for any inaccurate or incorrect statement in this article. The Centre of Research on Globalization grants permission to cross-post Global Research articles on community internet sites as long the source and copyright are acknowledged together with a hyperlink to the original Global Research article. For publication of Global Research articles in print or other forms including commercial internet sites, contact: publications@globalresearch.ca

www.globalresearch.ca contains copyrighted material the use of which has not always been specifically authorized by the copyright owner. We are making such material available to our readers under the provisions of "fair use" in an effort to advance a better understanding of political, economic and social issues. The material on this site is distributed without profit to those who have expressed a prior interest in receiving it for research and educational purposes. If you wish to use copyrighted material for purposes other than "fair use" you must request permission from the copyright owner.

For media inquiries: publications@globalresearch.ca