



MONETARY & ECONOMIC REVIEW

Volume XXIII, No. 1

Spring 2008

Obama's Global Poverty Act

By IRN/USA Radio News Editors

Republicans allowed a bill that carries Barack Obama's name to pass the Senate Foreign Relations Committee by voice vote (without any hearings). That means there was no roll-call vote, and thus members of that committee cannot be held accountable. It passed the House (also by voice vote) last year.

This dangerous bill, called the Global Poverty Act (S.2433) could come up in the Senate any day. It would commit U.S. taxpayers to spend 0.7 percent of our Gross Domestic Product on foreign handouts, which is at least \$30 billion over and above the exorbitant sums we already give away overseas.

Obama's bill would require the President "to develop and implement a comprehensive strategy to further the United States foreign policy objective of promoting the reduction of global poverty, the elimination of extreme global poverty, and the achievement of the Millennium Development Goal of reducing by one-half the proportion of people worldwide between 1990 and 2015, who live on less than \$1 per day."

The scariest phrase in Obama's bill is the "Millennium Development Goal." That refers to the Declaration adopted by the UN Millennium Assembly and Summit in 2000, which called for the "eradication of poverty" by "redistribution [of] wealth and land," cancellation of "the debts of developing countries," and "a fair distribution of the earth's resources" (*We wonder who would make those decisions?*— Editor).

The Millennium project is monitored by Jeffrey D. Sachs, a Columbia University economist. In 2005 he presented then UN Secretary General Kofi Annan with a 3,000-page report based on the research of 265 so-called poverty specialists. Sachs' document criticized the United States for giving only \$16.3 billion a year in global anti-poverty aid. He argued that we should spend an additional \$30 billion a year in order to reach the 0.7 percent target *that the UN set for us* in 2000.

Sachs says that the only way to *force* the United States to commit that much money is by a global tax, such as a tax on fossil fuels. Empowering the UN to impose a direct international tax on Americans has been a UN goal ever since the 1995 Copenhagen Summit.

By adopting the Millennium Goals in 2000, the UN escalated its demands for the UN to impose international taxes. Specifically, the Millennium called for a "currency transfer tax," a "tax on the rental value of land and natural resources," a "royalty on worldwide fossil energy production – oil, natural gas, coal," "fees for the commercial use of the oceans, fees for airplane use of the skies, fees for use of the electromagnetic spectrum, fees on foreign exchange transactions, and a tax on the carbon content of fuels."

Most of our foreign handouts end up in the hands of corrupt dictators who hate the United States (and consistently vote against us in the UN). Only 30 percent of our foreign-aid money ever reaches the poor.

There is much more to the Millennium Goals than merely extorting more money from U.S. taxpayers. The Goals set forth a plan to put the United States under UN global governance. These Goals include a "standing Peace Force" (UN standing army), a "UN Arms register" of all small arms and light weapons, "peace education" covering "all levels from pre-school through university," and "political control of the global economy." The Goals call for implementing all the UN treaties that the United States has never ratified, all of which set up UN monitoring committees to undermine our sovereignty.

To achieve this level of control over U.S. domestic law, the plan calls for "strengthening the United Nations for the 21st Century" by "eliminating" the veto and permanent membership in the Security Council. The goal is to reduce U.S. influence to 1 out of 192 nations, so we would have merely the same vote as Cuba. (*Eagle Forum*, April 21, 2008)

Editor's Note: Tell your Senators to kill Obama's un-American UN bill!

Liberals Want to Cut Federal Abstinence Education

President Bush's 2009 budget proposal includes \$204 million to support Community-Based Abstinence Education (CBAE), but dozens of liberals in Congress want all abstinence money cut from the budget.

CitizenLink.com (the online news service of Focus on the Family), reported on March 24 this year that 76 representatives in Congress – all abortion supporters – have signed a letter sponsored by Rep. Jim Moran (D-VA) asking the House of Appropriations Committee to cut all abstinence-education funding. That letter follows another letter sent by Representatives on the other side of the issue, Lee Terry (R-NE) and Mike McIntyre (D-NC), urging support for CBAE funding and current guidelines.

The debate arose following publication of a study by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention that shows one in four teen girls in the U.S. has a sexually transmitted Infection (STI).

With 3 million teen girls infected with STIs, safer sex in adolescence does not exist,” said Linda Klepacki, sexual health analyst for Focus on the Family Action. “For the current and future health of teens, we must teach them how to have strong relationships not based on sex.”

The American Journal of Health Behavior published a study in January showing that students who receive abstinence education are 50 percent less likely to initiate sex. Additionally, last year’s report by the Federal Department of Health and Human Services showed that some of the comprehensive sex-education curricula taught in the nation’s schools essentially have little or no impact on behavior.

Valerie Huber, executive director of the National Abstinence Education Association, stated, “It is time that society puts public health in front of ideological agendas and recognizes that abstinence education is the best health message for America’s youth.” (Source: *Citizen Link.com* 3/24/08)

Action: Abstinence education also is coming up in Senate. Ask your senators to support CBAE.

Good News: Kansas Supreme Court Unseals Planned Parenthood Suit

On May 2, 2008, Kansas’ highest court unsealed a lawsuit today by a Planned Parenthood clinic against a prosecutor who has charged the clinic with violating state abortion laws and manufacturing false documents, according to the Associated Press.

The court rejected a letter from former Attorney General Paul Morrison that would have cleared Planned Parenthood of any wrongdoing.

Johnson County District Attorney Phill Kline has charged Planned Parenthood’s Kansas City clinic, Comprehensive Health, with 107 criminal charges in district court, including 23 felonies.

Planned Parenthood wanted the court to order Kline to return medical records from 30 patients’ files. But the court ruled today that Kline has proper legal clearance to be in possession of the abortion records.

It’s about time the courts allowed Phill Kline to do his job and conduct this investigation involving serious allegations against Planned Parenthood,” said Dawn Vargo, bioethics analyst for Focus on the Family Action. (Source: *CitizenLink.org* May 2, 2008)