New UN General Assembly President: Old Wine in a New Bottle
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The United Nations General Assembly elected Mogens Lykketoft of Denmark as president of its upcoming 70th session, which commences this September. Mr. Lykketoft has served in various government positions, including as Denmark’s foreign minister and finance minister, and most recently as the speaker of the parliament. Based on his past record, he will likely be a cheerleader for the wealth redistributionist ideology prevalent at the United Nations, as well as adding to the UN’s chorus against Israel. There may be a new General Assembly president, but he fits the established UN mold to a T.

“What is now in front of Member States is the final stretch towards adopting a universal, people-centred, transformative development agenda that addresses the struggle of our lifetime,” the General Assembly president-elect told the delegates whom had elected him. How would he envision accomplishing such a transformation? We “need to redistribute wealth and income,” he explained to reporters following his General Assembly remarks.

Mr. Lykketoft is a member of Denmark’s left wing Social Democrats party, which he once led. He admires Karl Marx, declaring two years ago that “certain parts of Marx’s analysis is very relevant in the present.”

Mr. Lykketoft likes to promote Denmark’s own egalitarian model, which he helped spearhead. In a publication entitled “the Danish Model,” he wrote that “disposable incomes are distributed more evenly in Denmark than in most other countries in the world.” He boasted how better Denmark was than the United States in reducing income inequality, and appeared to be proud of the fact that “Taxes and social expenses constitute twice as big a share of the gross national product in Denmark as in the USA.” He neglected to mention that Denmark’s suicide rate is higher than the U.S. suicide rate as well.

Mr. Lykketoft also has demonstrated an animus against Israel. For example, as Denmark’s foreign minister back in 2001, he declared that the assassination of Israeli Tourism Minister Rehavam Ze’evi by Palestinian terrorists was no worse than Israel’s targeted killing of terrorists. In a glaring display of moral relativism, he claimed that “all these types of murder, including what is called Israel’s extrajudicial killing of Palestinian leaders,” are equally harmful.

That same year, Mr. Lykketoft called for the European Union to impose sanctions on Israel on account of its settlements.

In 2011, he defended the right of Danes to boycott Israeli goods “in protest against Israel’s colonization of the West Bank.”

Last year, after visiting the Palestinians in the West Bank, but snubbing Israeli officials during an official government visit to the region, Mr. Lykketoft said that “the present Israeli government has no intention to contribute to formation of a sovereign Palestinian state.” He didn’t seem bothered by Palestinian intransigence on key points such as the so-called right of return, the rocket attacks launched from Gaza or the Palestinian leaders’ rejection of several peace offers that would have given them much of what they said they were seeking.

In an interview last year with the Jydske Vestkysten daily, Mr. Lykketoft said Ariel Sharon, the late Israeli prime minister who presided over Israel’s unilateral complete withdrawal of troops and settlers from Gaza, was “a brutal military leader who was not interested in reaching an agreement with the Palestinians.” The fact that Hamas turned around and used Gaza as a terrorist launching pad against Israeli civilians is lost on the UN General Assembly president-elect, who believes that Israel must return to the pre-1967 lines irrespective of the consequences.

Now, Mogens Lykketoft will have a global platform as president of the UN General Assembly to promote his ideology to a largely sympathetic audience. Fortunately, the General Assembly has become little more than an annoying but meaningless echo chamber in which pretentious speeches and non-binding resolutions allow delegates to delude themselves into believing they are doing something important.