



Hillel Neuer @HillelNeuer

Feb 13 · 15 tweets · [HillelNeuer/status/1492820092299657218](https://twitter.com/HillelNeuer/status/1492820092299657218)

This interview of [@amnesty](#)'s [@AgnesCallamard](#) [@philipluther](#) reminded me of my first experience arriving at the UNHRC 18 years ago.

In March 2004, I heard Special Rapporteur on hunger Jean Ziegler present a report on only 1 country: Israel. It was starving Palestinians, he said.¹



Shany Mor شاني مور
@ShMMor · [Follow](#)



This absolute car crash of an interview by [@AgnesCallamard](#) & [@PhilipLuther](#) makes for an instructive read. Remember, they weren't ambushed on some obscure topic, but asked a few simple questions on the very thing they flew out here to present.

timesofisrael.com/amnesty-to-toi...

1/



timesofisrael.com

Amnesty to ToI: No double standard in accusing Israel, but not C...
Our diplomatic correspondent conducted a lengthy, mutually frustrating conversation with the Amnesty officials behind the ...

2:17 PM · Feb 4, 2022



[Read the full conversation on Twitter](#)

♡ 627 💬 Reply 🔗 Copy link

[Read 32 replies](#)

Ziegler was applauded by the PLO, Syria, Iran and other Arab & Muslim delegations. But at his meeting with NGOs, I asked him: “As the UNHRC's expert on hunger, why of all places in the world did you choose to investigate the Palestinian territories? What was your methodology?” 2

“My methodology?” asked Ziegler. “You think I simply decided to visit Palestine? Not at all... I received many requests to go there...from stakeholders, NGOs, and others like the Red Cross.”

But sitting next to me was Laura from the Red Cross. “Not true,” she whispered to me. 3

“I'm the expert on these issues for the Red Cross,” Laura told me, “and we never asked Jean Ziegler to visit the Palestinian territories.”

I then learned who the UNHRC's Jean Ziegler was: co-founder of the Qaddafi Human Rights Prize, and a serial liar. 4

<http://www.azure.org.il/download/magazine/az32%20neuer.pdf>

But I also learned something else: that whenever one asked anyone at the U.N. — a mandate-holder, diplomat or activist — why they singled out Israel for selective and disproportionate condemnation, they would become visibly uncomfortable and irritated, and begin to dissemble. 5

A World Council of Churches official, at his Geneva office next to the UNHRC, admitted to me that there was a double standard. But it was justified, he said, though he didn't seem to be sure why. Maybe because we expect more from Israel, being a democracy & so forth, he said. 6

When I asked a Spanish diplomat why her country and others in the EU voted for 15 resolutions against Israel at the UNGA—when there was only 1 on Syria, Iran & North Korea —she rejected the idea that there was any discrimination. “It's because Israel is an occupier,” she said. 7

If so, I asked the Spanish diplomat, then why weren't there annual UN resolutions on Turkey's occupation of Cyprus, Armenia's occupation of Nagorno-Karabakh, or Morocco's occupation of Western Sahara?

“Are you saying those are the same?” she replied, testily. 8

“No,” I said, “but you just said the deciding factor was occupation, and yet there are numerous examples of occupation in the world that fail to attract a single U.N. resolution.”

She began to get upset. It was clear she wasn't interested in any self-reflection on her logic. 9

It was also clear that this European deputy ambassador firmly believed Israel was justifiably deserving of 15 times more U.N. censure than Iran, Syria & North Korea, but that she would not be able to coherently explain why. Like those Amnesty folks challenged by

[@Lazar Berman](#). 10

In 2004, together with David Harris of the AJC, I met Louise Arbour, then U.N. High Commissioner for Human Rights, and a former Canadian Supreme Court Justice. We asked her why there were so many UNHRC resolutions condemning Israel, but none criticizing Palestinian terrorism. /11

“But Israel is a state,” said Arbour, “and the Palestinians, you see, are not a state. One cannot expect them to be treated the same.”

She said this 3 years after the U.N. was able to adopt a Security Council resolution condemning the Taliban and Al-Qaida, both non-states. /12

Being a state did not determine what the U.N. could condemn. The U.N. has been perfectly able to condemn murder & terrorism by non-state actors. It could have condemned Arafat's terrorist war that killed over 1,000 Israelis & severely injured thousands. It just chose not to. /13

Note the trick: Arbour wanted to justify UN inaction on Palestinian terror & its selective condemnation of Israel, so she argued Palestinian jurisdiction was weak.

So too, Ken Roth minimized PA jurisdiction on health, to urge condemnation of Israel. /14



Roth pretended not to know about the legal power the PA had, per the Oslo Accords, over Health and Vaccinations.

Yet otherwise, Ken Roth and UN officials argue the opposite: that the PA has SO MANY POWERS that it's even legally a state—and so can join the ICC and sue Israel. /15

