

THE U.N. WAR AGAINST AMERICA ANNUAL BRIEFING REPORT

2007



PREPARED BY
THE NATIONAL COMMITTEE AGAINST THE U.N. TAKEOVER
A PROJECT OF AMERICA'S SURVIVAL, INC., CLIFF KINCAID, PRESIDENT

The United Nations moved ahead on September 19, 2006, with a plan for global taxes. It's called UNITAID and is designed to purchase anti-AIDS drugs. It sounds compassionate. But this new scheme could make the oil-for-food scandal look penny ante. This is just the foot-in-the-door for more extensive global taxation schemes.

What's more, the U.N. has selected a new Secretary-General who is an ardent advocate of global taxes.

In an official press release, the U.N. announced, "UNITAID will be funded by innovative financing mechanisms such as a contribution on air tickets...and the Secretary-General congratulated the Governments of France, Brazil, Chile, Norway, and the United Kingdom for leading the way in developing the initiative."

The phrase, "innovative financing mechanisms," is a euphemism for global taxes. By insisting the money will go to fight deadly diseases, the U.N. hopes that opposition to global taxes can be overcome and that, in the future, the money can go for other purposes, such as creating a standing U.N. army. Such a proposal may strike some as fanciful but increasing international pressure to send U.N. "blue helmets" to places like Darfur will give U.N. apologists another reason to argue for more reliable and independent sources of revenue for the world body. That means global taxes.

On the matter of UNITAID, then-U.N. Secretary-General Kofi Annan said its formation was "encouraging news in the world of financing for development. This international facility for the purchase of drugs is a shining example of an innovative source of funding that can help us reach the Millennium Development Goals."

Once again, this requires translation. Under the so-called Millennium Development Goals, according to U.N. adviser Dr. Jeffrey Sachs, the U.S. owes an additional \$845 billion in foreign aid. Sachs has suggested a global tax on energy to generate this money. The U.N. has even studied the feasibility of a 35 cent-per-gallon global gas tax.

Continuing with his comments on UNITAID, Annan added, "Let me congratulate the Governments of

France, Brazil, Chile, Norway and the United Kingdom on their leadership in developing this initiative, and in advancing similar innovative financing mechanisms, such as the International Financing Facility."

The International Finance Facility (IFF) is another new international agency that would allow greater sums of foreign aid money "to be delivered today and paid for tomorrow," as supporters put it. Taxpayers of various countries would be on the hook for the additional money promised in advance by their governments. The IFF could also receive global tax revenue from other sources. The Bush Administration has refused so far to participate in this scheme.

ACTION FROM THE WHITE HOUSE

In response to a letter and petitions opposing global taxes from National Committee Against the U.N. Takeover, White House chief of staff Joshua B. Bolten informed President Cliff Kincaid that the matter is now in the hands of the National Economic Council (NEC), an entity created for the purpose of advising the President on matters related to U.S. and global economic policy. The NEC was established in 1993 within the Office of Policy Development and is part of the Executive Office of the President.

The NEC, according to the White House, "has four principal functions: to coordinate policy-making for domestic and international economic issues, to coordinate economic policy advice for the President, to ensure that policy decisions and programs are consistent with the President's economic goals, and to monitor implementation of the President's economic policy agenda."



SENATOR HILLARY CLINTON'S FORMER AIDE, IRA MAGAZER, IS IN CHARGE OF A GLOBAL TAXATION PROJECT TO EXPLOIT AIDS.

National Committee Against the U.N. Takeover believes that UNITAID deserves serious scrutiny for several reasons. First, it is now conceded that estimates of AIDS cases have been greatly exaggerated by the U.N., especially in Africa. It is not clear what kind of problem we are really facing worldwide. Second, anti-AIDS drugs, which can be toxic to the body and possibly cause the AIDS virus to mutate, are not seen by all experts as a panacea. And third, Ira Magaziner, who runs the Clinton Foundation's HIV/AIDS initiative and is a key player in UNITAID, doesn't have a good track record on health care issues. He is the same Ira Magaziner who was behind Hillary Clinton's disastrous national health care plan when she was First Lady. That plan, rejected by Congress as government-driven and socialist-oriented, was developed in secret by a health care task force under Mrs. Clinton's supervision. When the operations of this task force were challenged in court by the National Legal and Policy Center, a federal judge ruled that Magaziner had lied about how the plan had been conceived by special interest groups.

Having been absent from the political scene for years, Magaziner, with the help of Bill Clinton and the U.N., has now emerged to try to achieve globally what he failed to do domestically in the U.S.

The unveiling of UNITAID demonstrates that while the U.N. is increasingly perceived as a joke, corrupt, or worse, it nevertheless continues expanding its authority and influence throughout the world. Indeed, support for global tax measures is growing among those on the liberal-left side of the political spectrum.

CLINTON FOUNDATION PUSHES GLOBAL TAXES

Exploiting AIDS patients is a popular way to generate support for global taxes.

"Time to deliver" was the official theme of the 16th International AIDS Conference," held August 13-18 in Toronto, Canada. Bill Gates and Bill Clinton, whose foundations have assumed leading roles in promoting the use of global tax revenue to fight AIDS, were featured speakers.

FORMER PRESIDENT
CLINTON IS PROMOTING
A GLOBAL TAX SCHEME.



The conference is another indication that the international campaign for global taxes has decided to focus on the AIDS problem as the most effective way to generate hundreds of billions of dollars for the U.N. and other international agencies and non-governmental organizations (NGOs).

Described as the biennial gathering of the global AIDS community, the event drew 24,000 participants from more than 170 countries and featured a presentation on "diverse communities advocating together around the proposals for an airline solidarity contribution (ASC) and an international drug purchase facility (IDPF)," a project of the International finance Facility (IFF). The "airline solidarity contribution" is an international airline tax whose proceeds are supposed to be channeled to the IDPF, a British idea, and a new facility referred to as UNITAID, backed by the French. These entities would provide AIDS treatment and AIDS drugs.

The presentation on generating global support and expansion of the airline tax was given by Khalil Elouardighi, a French activist who runs international affairs for Act Up-Paris, described as "one of the most radical organizations in the fight against AIDS."¹ He has praised the airline tax as "a first step to ensuring genuine sustained funding"² to fight AIDS.

Last July 1, France began applying the new tax, which adds up to \$49 to the price of air tickets, depending on the distance traveled and the class of seat. French Foreign Minister Philippe Douste-Blazy says it is expected to bring in \$246 million a year.³

Referring to reports and actions taken during the Clinton Administration, Elouardighi has argued that, "America's National Security Council and the CIA are the best allies for activists like Act Up. These American security organizations are the first to point it out: Careful, things could go very far

indeed in Africa and Asia. The social situation will be unmanageable, sovereign states will disappear, there's a risk that street children orphaned by AIDS will form uncontrollable armed gangs."⁴ He was referring to a CIA report "The Global Infectious Disease Threat and its Implications for the United States", which was issued in January of 2000.³ In April of 2000, when the Clinton Administration declared AIDS to be a threat to national security and global security, the National Security Council initiated a review of U.S. policy to fight AIDS and the disease's worldwide effects. The Clinton Administration even took the matter to the U.N. Security Council, which passed resolution 1308 on July 17, 2000,⁵ designating HIV/AIDS a possible threat to international peace and security.

It has now been acknowledged, however, that estimates of AIDS cases have been grossly exaggerated. The inflated numbers have been blamed on poor testing, a misleading diagnosis of AIDS in Africa, erroneous computer-generated estimates by the U.N., and the desperate desire to generate funds for global purposes. Author and journalist Tom Bethell calls it "the official manipulation of medical science."⁶

One expert, Stuart WG Derbyshire, noted that:

Since 1985, AIDS has been defined in Africa on the basis of clinical observation (chronic diarrhea or prolonged fever and persistent cough or herpes) because of lack of HIV testing facilities. However, it is impossible to tell whether someone who develops malaria does so because of AIDS or because of normal impaired immunity. This definition has inflated the estimated AIDS figures. The danger of the AIDS epidemic is dwarfed by 3.5 million deaths from tuberculosis and 16.8 million deaths from malaria since the beginning of the AIDS epidemic. The frightening scenario looms that widespread, but curable, diseases are wrongly classified as AIDS-related complex, thereby foregoing appropriate treatment.⁷

The phony figures led one publication to run a story headlined, "Is the African AIDS pandemic a bluff?"⁸

The British magazine, the Spectator, examined the evidence and declared, "Africa Isn't Dying of AIDS." The December 2003 article concluded by saying, "Who knows, they may defeat AIDS, but what if we wake up five years hence to discover that the problem has been blown up out of all proportion by unsound estimates, causing upwards of \$20 billion to be wasted?"

In fact, U.S. funding for HIV/AIDS has already reached \$200 billion since 1981.⁹ But that is not enough for the AIDS activists.

Despite the serious questions that have been raised about the AIDS campaign, AIDS science, and the use of anti-AIDS drugs, the Council on Foreign Relations issued an alarmist report entitled, "HIV and National Security: Where Are the Links?"¹⁰ and the AIDS establishment has ramped up the rhetoric about the disease, calling it a "holocaust" that rivals the Nazi extermination campaign against the Jews.

David Bryden of the Global AIDS Alliance authored an inflammatory paper, "Call for a Grand Anglo-French Alliance to End the AIDS Holocaust," arguing that the British and the French should integrate the IFF and the "Airline Solidarity Contribution," beginning in 2007,¹¹ and that Britain should implement a tax on foreign exchange transactions to help finance the IFF.

On the global level, an international tax on financial transactions, the "Tobin Tax," has been a popular proposal to generate more money for the U.N. and other international agencies. Steven Solomon, a former staff reporter at Forbes, says that such a proposal "might net some \$13 trillion a year..."

In the report, Bryden also suggests that the U.S. should commit to spending more on foreign aid by eliminating or reducing "tax cuts for the wealthy" and cutting back on military spending.

In justifying the international taxation efforts, Paul Zeitz, Director of the Global AIDS Alliance, declared that AIDS is comparable to the threat posed by Hitler's Nazi regime.

"We learn from the history of the 1930s that threats to our security cannot be dealt with by attitudes of 'appeasement'," he declared. "Today, the threat posed to global security by the AIDS holocaust means

governments must exercise bold leadership, share big ideas and develop common strategies.”

In an attack on the Bush Administration, he said, “Given that the world’s superpower refuses effectively to exercise such leadership, or mobilize the scale of funds needed, a grand Anglo-French Alliance is now vital to end the AIDS holocaust. We urge the British and French to bury their differences and rivalry, and to merge their respective proposals.”¹²

At the same time, the “African Civil Society,” another group of NGOs, has issued a position paper on HIV and AIDS that urges “innovative means of mobilising additional domestic resources to secure sustainable and predictable financing for HIV and AIDS (such as the International Finance Facility and the Airline Solidarity Contribution)” and also urges reductions in military spending “in order to increase social spending...”¹³

Dr. Peter Piot, executive director of UNAIDS, has added his voice to the chorus, declaring, “New innovative sources of financing are absolutely necessary.”¹⁴ Piot was in attendance at the Paris conference on “innovative financing for development,” which attracted 18 international organizations and 60 non-governmental organizations, including the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation and the Clinton Foundation.

At the International AIDS Conference, in an unmistakable reference to global taxes, Piot said that “...we must put in place the mechanisms and agreements to ensure universal access to all lifesaving essentials – not just for the immediate future but for the long term.”¹⁵

CLINTON ECONOMIST PROMOTES GLOBAL TAXES

Nobel Prize-winning economist Joseph E. Stiglitz, perhaps the most prominent economic thinker in the Democratic Party, is also blowing the horn for global taxes. A chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers in the Bill Clinton Administration, Stiglitz has been described as a “real Democrat” and possible candidate to head the Federal Reserve¹⁶ in a Democratic Administration.

His first book, *Globalization and its Discontents*, was praised by billionaire leftist George Soros as “Penetrating, insightful.... A seminal work that must be read.”¹⁷ In it, Stiglitz suggested that while a global tax on currency transactions, the so-called Tobin Tax, was being seriously studied in Europe, it might involve serious “implementation problems.” But with his subsequent book, *Making Globalization Work*, those problems have vanished, as he argues for a variety of global tax schemes¹⁸ that would cost American taxpayers billions of dollars.

Stiglitz, who anticipates possibly serving in a Hillary Clinton Administration,¹⁹ foresees major changes in the global economy. Most of these involve soaking American taxpayers. He and Soros²⁰ are among those proposing the creation of new currencies to finance more foreign aid spending.

For his part, Stiglitz wants to generate hundreds of billions of dollars in what he calls “global greenbacks.” This is a new form of “global money,” he says, constituting one of several “innovative approaches to financing economic development [which] need to be tested.”²¹

“Who would receive the annual emissions of global greenbacks?” he asks. He suggests various approaches:

“...to allocate funds to different countries on the basis of their income and population (consistent with principles of social justice, poorer countries would get a larger allocation per capita).”

“...funds would be distributed through international institutions, either existing ones or newly created ‘special trust funds’ established under the auspices of the United Nations...”

“A portion might be used to help achieve the Millennium Development Goals – the goals the international community set for itself in reducing poverty by 2015...”²²

In *Making Globalization Work*, he specifically proposes several global tax schemes, arguing that:

“Taxation on global negative externalities, such as arms sales to developing countries,

pollution, and destabilizing cross-border financial flows, can provide a third source of revenue for financing global public goods.”²³

The term “global public goods” is part of a U.N. effort to claim there are certain matters beyond the ability of any one state to address and that the international community, including the U.N., must get involved in solving them.²⁴ As Stiglitz puts it:

“Globalization entails the closer integration of the countries of the world; this closer integration entails more interdependence, and this greater interdependence requires more collective action. Global public goods, the benefits of which accrue to all within the global community become more important. These include, for instance, health (funding a vaccine against malaria or AIDS, and the environment (reducing greenhouse gas emissions, maintaining biodiversity in rainforests). These should be first priorities for the funds.”²⁵

All of these ideas, which have been extremely popular at the United Nations, involve global taxes of some kind.

While he embraces global taxation as one important source of revenue, Stiglitz identifies two other sources of international revenue as resulting from reform of the global monetary system and the “management of global resources.”

In the first instance, he says that the global monetary system of the world should be reformed in order to produce funds to “promote development, fight poverty, and provide better education and health for all,” he says.²⁶ He says that global currency reserves, U.S. dollars held by various nations, especially China, should be transformed into “a new international currency” that can solve global problems. In the second instance, that of “management of global resources,” Stiglitz argues that revenue can be generated “for providing global public goods” through “auctioning off fishing rights, or the right to extract natural resources beneath the sea, or carbon emissions permits...”²⁷

At the “Second Annual Global Colloquium of University Presidents” last year, with then-United Nations Secretary-General Kofi Annan in attendance,

Stiglitz gave a talk entitled, “Innovative Sources of Funding for Global Public Goods,”²⁸ in which he presented these ideas in some detail.

NEW U.N. BOSS BACKS GLOBAL TAXES

While Annan was a big backer of global tax schemes, so is the new Secretary-General, Ban Ki-moon, the Minister of Foreign Affairs and Trade of the Republic of Korea, whose government “had put forward a draft bill for the creation of an air ticket solidarity contribution...” This is the international tax on airline travel now being implemented, some of whose proceeds are being provided to UNITAID, an international agency designed to purchase and distribute anti-AIDS drugs. Ban “said his country was pleased to be part of the pilot group launching UNITAID.”²⁹

There has been much speculation that South Korea’s support for global taxes and more foreign aid spending was a key factor in Ban Ki-moon’s selection as U.N. chief.

A story in the South Korean press reported:

After Minister of Foreign Affairs and Trade Ban Ki-moon announced his run for the U.N. secretary-general’s position, it was pointed out that Korea should raise its development spending to improve its voice in the global community. [Finance and Economy Minister] Kwon also said Korea plans to introduce the Solidarity Contribution on Airplane Tickets and muster its strength to help eradicate poverty and disease in the world. Beginning next year, the government plans to impose a 1,000 won tax

THE NEW U.N.
BOSS, BAN KI-MOON,
SUPPORTS GLOBAL
TAXES.



on the purchase of every ticket for international flights to help poor countries.³⁰

UNITAID is being set up by the International Drug Purchase Fund. To date, it says, 14 countries have expressed their intention to implement the same type of levy: Brazil, Chile, Cyprus, Congo, Gabon, Ivory Coast, France, Jordan, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Mauritius, Nicaragua, Norway and the United Kingdom.

The same press release announcing Ban Ki-moon's support of the global tax also noted that:

“William Jefferson Clinton, former President of the United States, said the Clinton Foundation was honored to be involved in this project and thanked France, in particular, for that country's role in spearheading the initiative.”³¹

Nancy Birdsall, president of the Center for Global Development, was initially ecstatic about the international airline tax, saying on her blog that it was “Time for the U.S. to Sign on.”³² She later backed away from this suggestion, saying that the funds would not go to the Global Fund to Fight AIDS but to a different entity that might not be accountable to U.S. taxpayers.³³

Despite not yet being designated as a recipient of international tax revenue, the Global Fund to Fight AIDS has welcomed the creation of UNITAID, saying it is an “innovative approach” that promises the “necessary sustainability of financing.”³⁴ Created in 2002 at the urging of Secretary-General Kofi Annan, the Global Fund already gets hundreds of millions of dollars from U.S. taxpayers.

Embroided in scandal and controversy, the organization considered hiring retiring Republican Rep. Jim Kolbe as its new executive director. However, Kolbe, who is openly homosexual, became the subject of reports that, like disgraced Rep. Mark Foley, he had maintained inappropriate relationships or contacts, possibly of a sexual nature, with male former congressional pages. The House Ethics Committee opened an investigation into this.

In a related problem involving conflict of interest, Associated Press reported³⁵ that Kolbe was up for

the job leading the Global Fund even though he had helped determine its funding as chairman of a House Appropriations subcommittee. AP said, “The committee's bill, approved May 25, included \$3.4 billion in global assistance to combat AIDS, tuberculosis and malaria, including \$445 million for the U.S. contribution to the Global Fund.” This figure, advocated by Kolbe, was over twice the amount requested by the Bush Administration.

Conservative groups had objected. Amanda Banks, federal issues analyst for Focus on the Family Action, said the Global Fund was an “unaccountable” organization, explaining, “It's not a U.S. program, it's an international fund and we have very, very little control over how it allocates money.”³⁶

She told citizenlink.com that “They are quite closed regarding how they spend the money. But we know that, in part, they support needle-exchange programs, the legalization of prostitution, abortion, as well as liberal organizations associated with billionaire George Soros.”

Soros also happens to figure in the financial underwriting of the non-governmental organization (NGO) that Stiglitz has created to carry his ideas forward. It's called the Initiative for Policy Dialogue, based at Columbia University. His funders³⁷ include:

- Open Society Institute.
- Ford Foundation.
- Charles Stewart Mott Foundation
- John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation
- United Nations Development Program.

At an event in September at Columbia University, Stiglitz appeared on a panel with Soros to discuss globalization. “People who write books generally don't have time to read them. I actually read this book [Making Globalization Work] ... and I'm glad I did,” Soros said.³⁸ The panel moderator, Tina Rosenberg of the New York Times, declared:

“Professor Stiglitz is on a **revolutionary track**. But there so far is no revolution, and that part is up to you.”³⁹ (emphasis added).

ENDNOTES

1. <http://www.worldpress.org/Europe/1738.cfm>
2. <http://www.aegis.com/NEWS/AFP/2006/AF060451.html>
3. Ibid.
4. <http://www.worldpress.org/Europe/1738.cfm>
5. It is available at: <http://www.ciaonet.org/wps/dod109/>
6. <http://www.humanevents.com/blog-detail.php?id=13920>
7. http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&list_uids=12319962&dopt=Abstract
8. <http://www.afrol.com/features/11116>
9. A report from the Henry J. Kaiser Family Foundation said that the U.S. Government had invested approximately \$150 billion for domestic and international HIV/AIDS programs from fiscal years 1981 to 2004. Federal funding in FY 2005 was \$19,855.1, \$21,073.0 in FY 2006, and a budget request of \$22,820.1 for FY 2007.
10. The report concluded that HIV/AIDS “is affecting the security of states throughout the world, weakening economies, military and police forces, government structures, and social structures.” See http://www.cfr.org/publication/8256/hiv_and_national_security.html
11. http://www.globalaidsalliance.org/docs/Call_for_Anglo-French_Alliance_020606.pdf
12. <http://www.afronets.org/archive/200602/msg00030.php>
13. http://worldaidscampaign.info/index.php/wac/wac/advocacy/joint_statements/african_civil_society_position_paper_on_hiv_and_aids_in_africa_moving_to_action
14. http://www.unaids.org/en/MediaCentre/PressMaterials/FeatureStory/20060228_airtax.asp
15. http://data.unaids.org/pub/Speech/2006/20060813_SP_Piot_en.pdf
16. http://epi.org/printer.cfm?id=57&content_type=1&nice_name=webfeatures_viewpoints_greenpan_appnt
17. <http://www.wwnorton.com/catalog/spring03/032439.htm>
18. In the paper, The Economic Case for a Tobin Tax, Thomas Palley of the Soros-funded Open Society Institute listed Stiglitz as a supporter of the tax.
19. Edmund Conway in the London Telegraph reports: “... Joseph Stiglitz, Nobel laureate and former economic adviser to Bill Clinton, says he wouldn’t hesitate if Hillary called up and asked him to do the same job for her.” See <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/core/Content/displayPrintable.jhtml?xml=/money/2006/08/28/ccprof28.xml&site=1&page=0>
20. Soros has proposed what he calls an annual issue of Special Drawing Rights (SDR) that rich countries would donate for international assistance.
21. <http://www.globalpolicy.org/socecon/ffd/2002/0322greenback.htm>
22. Joseph E. Stiglitz, *Making Globalization Work*, (2006, New York: W.W. Norton & Company), pages 266-267.
23. Ibid. page 281
24. See <http://www.undp.org/globalpublicgoods/>
25. Ibid. *Making Globalization Work*, page 266.
26. Ibid. page 146.
27. Ibid., page 281.
28. <http://www.dailyprincetonian.com/archives/2006/02/15/news/14469.shtml>
29. <http://www.un.org/news/Press/docs/2006/aids127.doc.htm>
30. <http://times.hankooki.com/lpage/nation/200609/kt2006092218484811960.htm>
31. <http://www.un.org/news/Press/docs/2006/aids127.doc.htm>
32. http://blogs.cgdev.org/globaldevelopment/2006/09/airline_tax_for_aids_drugs_tak.php
33. http://blogs.cgdev.org/globaldevelopment/2006/09/airline_tax_proposal_falls_sho.php
34. http://www.theglobalfund.org/en/media_center/press/an_060920.asp
35. <http://www.azstarnet.com/dailystar/150752>
36. <http://www.family.org/cforum/extras/a0040614.cfm>
37. <http://www0.gsb.columbia.edu/ipd/aboutus/institutionlist.cfm?inid=2>
38. <http://www.columbiaspectator.com/media/storage/paper865/news/2006/09/19/News/Stiglitz.Makes.Globalization.Work-2284594.shtml?nrewrite200610241326&sourcedomain=www.columbiaspectator.com>
39. Ibid.

WHO SUPPORTS GLOBAL TAXES?

“If such a global government were to act in the interests of world citizens as a whole, then global welfare maximization is likely to imply substantial positive taxes on almost everyone in the richer countries and substantial transfers to the majority of people in low-income countries.”

– U.N. Secretary-General Kofi Annan, “*Innovative Sources of Financing for Development. Note by the Secretary-General.*” August 17, 2004.

“Proposals for any form of global taxation meet immediate opposition from powerful elements in the US Congress. On the other hand, there is widespread appreciation of the need for new resource flows to allow the MDGs [Millennium Development Goals] to be achieved.”

– A.B. Atkinson, editor, *New Sources of Development Finance. United Nations University. World Institute for Development Economics Research. Oxford University Press, 2005. Preface. Page 2.*

“With the votes of 115 countries, the UN General Assembly in 2004 adopted a resolution calling for an examination of international taxes as an instrument of development financing...The front of the backers of international taxation is growing broader and broader.”

– Peter Wahl, “*From Concept to Reality. On the present state of the debate on international taxes.*” ES Briefing paper. June 2006

“A global tax on carbon-emitting fossil fuels might be the way to begin. Even a very small tax, less than that which is needed to correct humanity’s climate-deforming overuse of fossil fuels, would finance a greatly enhanced supply of global public goods.”

– Jeffrey Sachs, adviser to U.N. Secretary-General Kofi Annan, August 1999.

“The ‘purest’ form of international taxation would consist of a tax imposed by a sovereign international government under sovereignty surrendered or relinquished to it by national governments.”

– *Finance for Sustainable Development: The Road Ahead. Proceedings of the Fourth Group Meeting on Financial Issues of Agenda 21, Santiago, Chile, 1997. United Nations, New York, 1997.*

“Innovative sources have a role to play as sources of additional financing. These include: the International Finance Facility, different voluntary contributions and taxes...”

– Jose Antonio Ocampo, UN Under-Secretary General for Economic and Social Affairs. June 28, 2005.

“More Taxes! Promoting Strategies for Global Taxation.”

– Title of book published by ATTAC (Association for the Taxation of Financial Transactions for the Benefit of Citizens) Finland.

“Bold and innovative steps are urgently needed to tap the world’s wealth. Global taxes offer the most promising approach.”

– James A. Paul & Katarina Wahlberg, “*Global Taxes for Global Priorities.*” *World Economy, Ecology and Development (WEED).* Published by Global Policy Forum, March 2002.

A global tax on carbon use of 4.8 cents per US gallon “would yield annual revenue of about \$130 billion per year...an OECD study estimates the revenue from a carbon tax...at US \$750 billion per year...the equivalent of approximately 35 cents per US gallon...”

– Agnar Sandmo, “*Environmental Taxation for Revenue for Development.*” United Nations University. World Institute for Development Economics Research. Discussion Paper no. 2003/86, December 2003.

“Global redistribution through taxes that would be levied by an international body may seem far-fetched today, but the logic of development that we are witnessing – particularly the move away from nation-states as the locus of sovereignty – suggests that it may eventually come to pass.”

– Branko Milanovic, *economist with the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace and the World Bank.*, “*An Inequality Tax*,” published by Project Syndicate.

“International taxation is necessary because globalization leads to an erosion of national tax systems...The democratic implementation of international taxes and their socially just design depend on constant pressure from the global justice movement and a broad discussion in the global community.”

– Peter Wahl, “*International Taxation. Regulating Globalization – Financing Development*,” May 2005, *World Economy, Ecology and Development (WEED)*.

“Global taxes and fees – whether levied on carbon, aviation fuel or international financial transactions – can fulfill the twin goals of generating funds for peace and sustainable development as well as incorporating social and environmental costs into private decision making....The very word ‘tax’ is loaded with negative connotations and is often synonymous with political death. For this reason, couching proposals in terms of a fee, levy or charge will be decidedly more palatable to policymakers.”

– Kevin Baumert, “*Global Taxes and Fees: Recent Developments and Overcoming Obstacles*.” May 1997. Published by Global Policy Forum.



CHIEF OF STAFF TO THE PRESIDENT
THE WHITE HOUSE

October 23, 2006

Mr. Cliff Kincaid
President
America's Survival, Inc.

Dear Mr. Kincaid:

Thank you for your letter and enclosed petitions regarding global taxes. I appreciate you and the supporters of America's Survival, Inc. sharing your views.

Consideration of this issue is appropriately handled by the National Economic Council. We have shared your letter with the appropriate offices there.

Once again, thank you for your correspondence. I wish you all the best.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "J. B. Bolten", with a long horizontal stroke extending to the right.

Joshua B. Bolten



PREPARED BY
THE NATIONAL COMMITTEE AGAINST THE U.N. TAKEOVER
A PROJECT OF AMERICA'S SURVIVAL, INC., CLIFF KINCAID, PRESIDENT