



institut du développement durable et des relations internationales – 6, rue du Général Clergerie – 75116 Paris – France – Tél. : 01 53 70 22 35 – iddri@iddri.org – www.iddri.org

idées
POUR LE DÉBAT

N° 04/2002 | GOUVERNANCE MONDIALE

Global taxation: The rise, decline and future of an idea at the United Nations

Ruben P. Mendez (New York and Yale Universities)

Ruben P. Mendez, professeur et associé des universités de New York et de Yale, ex-PNUD, a présenté cette communication

lors de l'atelier sur la fiscalité mondiale et le financement du développement durable, qui s'est tenu les 7 et 8 novembre

2002 à Paris. Cet atelier était co-organisé par l'Idetri et l'AfD. Ce texte n'engage que son auteur.

Tous droits réservés

Atelier
Fiscalité mondiale et financement du développement durable,
coorganisé par l'Iddri et l'AfD, Paris, 7 et 8 novembre 2002.

Global taxation: the rise, decline and future of an idea at the United Nations

Ruben P. Mendez

Erstwhile of UNDP

Adjunct Professor and Fellow

New York and Yale Universities

Working paper, D.R. 2002.

Contents

Proto- international taxation at the United Nations	3
A genesis of the idea at the United Nations	4
Progress of the idea	6
Decline	9
The future	10

It is a pleasure for me to participate in this important conference on a controversial but cutting-edge subject, bringing together as it does distinguished economists, executives, and policy makers. This welcome initiative of IDDRI should further the study, development and realisation of global taxation and enhance its standing in both the academy and the arena of advocacy, policy and decision-making. I am optimistic that in the fertile intellectual soil of France this will be an important milestone in the development of a rational and effective system of international public finance.

Professor Frankman has just given an excellent, comprehensive history of global taxation. My presentation will be more circumscribed. It will trace the rise, decline and future of the idea at the United Nations. As a former international bureaucrat, I am pleased that I will now be speaking outside the constraints of the international civil service.

Proto-international taxation at the United Nations

The idea and practice of global taxation at the United Nations may be said to have started with the system of financing the Organisation's original, regular budget, which is completely from the contributions of member governments. These contributions have the essential characteristic of taxes in that they are obligatory. They are also in accord with modern fiscal principles in that they are "progressive"—using a scale that assesses countries based on the principle of their capacity to pay. The regular budget used to include the cost of the UN's peacekeeping operations, but starting in 1956 special accounts have been created to finance them. The peacekeeping accounts are based on the same principle of capacity to pay and have an even more "progressive" scale of assessments¹.

Member governments, of course, often flout their obligations. This may make the UN and its specialized agencies seem more like clubs than formal public institutions. But the rules are there, with the status of international law, and there is at least moral pressure on governments to be more law-abiding. Another apparent difference lies in the fact that the regular budget is often considered an administrative budget. In fact, it is officially called a "programme budget", although this admittedly may sound misleading. It could be pointed out, however, that the developing countries have always insisted on retaining the "regular technical assistance budget", as a reminder that the UN, as specified in the Charter (cf. the League of Nations' Covenant), is concerned with economic and social development. The regular budget also includes an appropriation for the environment through the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP). And the UN's growing peacekeeping accounts—a successor arrangement of the regular budget and funded mainly by obligatory government contributions—are a counterpart of national budgets for peace and order and for national defence, which in modern times depend on national taxation.

A genesis of the idea at the United Nations

Until the 1970s concrete proposals involving the concept of international taxation were desultory, although they had other significant ramifications. Several have been cited in the literature: In the early 1950s, the General Assembly requested, and a committee appointed by the Secretary-General prepared, a study that recommended an international compensatory scheme for the stabilization of commodity prices². In 1957, the General Assembly established an *ad hoc* Sea Bed Committee to pursue the idea of using the world's sea-bed resources "in the interests of mankind"³. In 1970, the Committee for Development Planning considered a proposal for a tax on a limited number of consumer durable goods, the possession of which was indicative of the attainment of a high level of living by the purchaser. It would be collected by the national tax authorities and used for financing international development⁴. And in 1975 and 1976, the Ambassador of Saudi Arabia introduced resolutions to the General Assembly's Economic and Financial Committee proposing that all oil-producing countries levy a "value added tax of one cent per barrel," which would be deposited in a special account of UNEP "to help save the biosphere for mankind."⁵

In view of the inability of the regular budget to address economic and social needs, the Third World countries in the UN at first sought larger resource flows through special "extra-budgetary" funds based on voluntary contributions by the richer countries. This proved to be a great disappointment. These facilities were poorly supplied, unreliable and unassured, and the Western European and Others Group (WEOG), comprising roughly the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) countries, vigorously opposed what they called a "proliferation" of funds and maintained the bulk of their overseas assistance under bilateral arrangements. At the initiative of the developing countries, there were entreaties by the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC), as well as their subsidiary organs, that international financial flows be made more "predictable, continuous, and increasingly assured".⁶ It is from this principle that the current ideas on global taxation at the United Nations have evolved.

It became increasingly obvious that these entreaties, whose goals were shared by the Development Assistance Committee (DAC) of OECD, were in vain. This is borne out by the fact that Official Development Assistance (ODA) as a percentage of the Gross National Income (GNI) of the DAC member countries has stagnated at about one-third of the generally accepted goal of 0.7 per cent. It was 0.22 per cent in 2000.⁷

An economic analysis of the historical record of ODA indicates that this is the level one can realistically expect under an international regime of voluntarism. In this *laissez-faire* regime the historical, stagnant level of the voluntary transfer of resources would indicate that it has reached what welfare economists call a "Pareto optimum", i.e., a state that is optimal in that there can be no reallocation of resources that can make anyone better off (e.g., a least developed country) without making at least another worse off (e.g., a DAC

country, which has been giving ODA voluntarily and presumably painlessly). The Pareto criterion is a generally accepted benchmark of welfare economics in formulating public policy, which is probably why the ODA regime has persisted for so long on the watch of OECD. It has proved distinctly inadequate in meeting the world's economic and social needs and, of course, has nothing to do with peace and security.

It is because of the inherent shortcomings of voluntarism that the principle of "automaticity" evolved. This principle, along with global taxation as it is now treated at the UN, was first introduced within the UN system at the United Nations Conference on Desertification (UNCOD), which was held in Nairobi in 1977. There was a consensus at the Conference on the importance of the problem, which was engulfing countries south of the Sahara, and its causes and the measures necessary to combat it. These were to be embodied in a world "Plan of Action". Delegates from both North and South spoke on the subject in emotional and sometimes grandiloquent language. When it came to how to finance the Plan, however, there was the usual bitter wrangling between North and South. The most affected countries proposed the establishment of an anti-desertification "special account" funded from voluntary contributions. The developed countries opposed it vigorously and acerbically. It was approved only "in principle" and by vote rather than by consensus, and only after the Western and Eastern European, American, and Japanese delegates made a point of denouncing it, one by one, from the podium.

The Secretary-General of the Conference and concurrently Executive Director of UNEP, Dr. Mostafa K. Tolba; Maurice Strong, his predecessor at UNEP and one of the most "activist" personalities in the UN family; and I expected the conflict. We were also aware that the customary lip service to be given to the need for augmenting ODA would be futile. What was needed was a means of financing on a more predictable, reliable and sustained basis. Dr. Tolba presented a "conference room paper" to the Conference's Committee of the Whole proposing international taxation and "automaticity." The delegates listened politely, but I knew there would be questions and criticisms raised at the working level, where the actual drafting and negotiations would take place.

As the secretariat's economic and financial adviser, I was responsible for the financial section of the Plan. In the working groups and "subgroups," I drafted, with the Rapporteurs, a proposal that the Conference and later the UNEP Governing Council, call a panel of high-level experts in international financing to prepare a study of "additional measures and means of financing ... the Plan of Action to Combat Desertification ... such as funds-in-trust, fiscal measures entailing automaticity, and an international fund, and to submit a final report on the subject ... to the General Assembly." I chose the bland phrase, "fiscal measures entailing automaticity," studiously since I knew we would be entering controversial ground. "Automaticity" would involve resource mobilization similar to that used in national public systems of finance, as distinguished from the existing international regime based on discretionary, voluntary contributions. Although it was tucked into a much longer section dealing with the various aspects of finance and the economic costs of desertification, delegates

raised questions. In the event, I was able to preserve this wording through the maze of working groups, committees and finally the plenary. The Third World delegates showed some interest, although they were caught by surprise. The delegates from the developed countries and the Socialist bloc did not object; they usually vote against proposals for more funds but are agreeable to more studies.

Progress of the idea

Dr. Tolba, in his capacity as head of UNEP, asked me to act as secretary of the group of high-level experts with the responsibility for preparing the working papers and drafts of the study, first for a core and subsequently for the entire group, which included Rodrigo Botero of Colombia, Felipe Herrera of the InterAmerican Development Bank, Maurice Strong, Mahbub Ul-Haq, Joseph Yager of the Brookings Institution, and others. (A complete list may be found in the final report, which I have should any of you be interested.) After several sessions, the group, at a meeting in Paris from 13 to 16 March 1978, adopted with some modifications the study I had drafted. The study dealt extensively with a wide range of options. In bolder language than is usual for UN documents, the report stressed the need for “additionality” and “automaticity.” It discussed and proposed as additional sources of financing revenues from the use of global commons, the taxation of trade flows, military expenditures and arms transfers, savings from disarmament, and a link between Special Drawing Rights (SDRs) and development. In accordance with UN practice, the study was sent first to the UNEP Governing Council, where it was discussed pro and con, then to ECOSOC, and finally to the General Assembly.⁸ The Assembly “took note” of it in December and asked the Secretary-General to solicit the views of Governments.⁹ A questionnaire was circulated, but the government responses were few and inconclusive.

In December 1979, the General Assembly requested the Secretary-General to prepare, in consultation with UNEP, a more comprehensive study, including a “complete inventory of relevant ideas and proposals put forward in the United Nations System” on financing mechanisms involving automaticity.¹⁰ Dr. Tolba, who was the prime mover of the idea, again engaged another group of high-level experts and me to prepare a second study. More extensive and detailed than the first, this study¹¹ dealt with the following:

- international taxation, including a general trade tax, taxes on specific traded commodities, on “invisibles,” on the reverse transfer of technology (also known as the reverse “brain drain”), on surpluses in the balance of trade, and consumption taxes.
- charges for the use of the global commons, including deep ocean resources, international air space, the moon, Antarctica and the Southern Ocean, telecommunications frequencies, “parking fees” for satellites in the finite geostationary orbit, taxes on polluters of the marine environment as well as revenues ocean fishing and from

offshore resources before the legitimization of the Exclusive Economic Zones (EEZs);

- military taxes and savings from disarmament;
- monetary measures, such as an SDR-development link and a link between gold sales and development;
- international compensation for fluctuations in commodity trade and for orderly commodities development; and
- other miscellaneous proposals, including, a world-wide lottery, and a “tax-like” proposal for the introduction of special contributions by multinational corporations operating in developing countries.

The second study went through the same process as the first. The General Assembly took note of the study, and UNEP, again on behalf of the Secretary-General, solicited the views of governments with inconclusive results. The proposals in the studies were never put to a vote, which would undoubtedly have been negative.

The UNEP initiative, however, was a milestone in the evolution of the idea of global taxation at the United Nations. It was the first, pathbreaking introduction of the idea in a holistic framework rather than desultorily, and placed the subject officially for the first time on the UN’s agenda. It was commended by the Secretary-General in his reports to the General Assembly, and it encouraged and set a precedent for subsequent studies and proposals within the UN System. There was a third study in 1981, which included feasibility studies of selected measures.¹² The United Nations Conference on Science and Technology for Development (1979) adopted a “Financing System” that included elements of the UNEP approach. The World Summit for Social Development held in Copenhagen (1995) called for studies of new and innovative means of financing along these lines, and papers prepared for the International Conference on Financing for Development in Monterrey (2002) included a number of the UNEP proposals. Thus, future studies, reports, and proposals on the subject of international taxation and related innovative means of financing have tended to follow the integrated menus presented in the first two UNEP studies.

Perhaps more significantly, a number of the proposals were picked up by subsequent influential international commissions, whose memberships included former members of the UNEP groups, and to which I made special presentations and acted as an adviser. Their reports were widely circulated—through academic/commercial publishers, directly to Governments, and as official documents for the General Assembly and United Nations summit conferences. These were the:

- Independent Commission on International Development Issues (the “Brandt Commission”, after its chairman, Willy Brandt), which produced *North-South: a programme for survival* (1980) and *Common Crisis* (1983). The first report supported the idea of “automatic revenues,” stating that “over time the world must move to a financing system in which a progressively larger share of ...

revenues is raised by these means.” It suggested taxes on international trade, ocean fishing and military expenditures, and the use by the IMF of its gold stocks as collateral for borrowings intended for developing countries.¹³ The second report dealt extensively with an SDR-development link¹⁴;

- World Commission on Environment and Development (the “Brundtland Commission”, after Gro Harlem Brundtland, who chaired it). Its main report, *Our Common Future* (1987), referred to the UNEP initiative and the Brandt Commission, and suggested automatic sources of financing including revenues from the international commons, trade taxes, and linking SDRs and gold sales with development¹⁵; and
- Commission on Global Governance¹⁶, which produced *Our Global Neighbourhood* and a companion volume, *Issues in Global Governance*, both in 1995. The main report recommended inter alia, revenues from international taxation and use of the global commons including a small surcharge on international airline tickets, ocean maritime transport, Antarctica, the geostationary orbit, and the electromagnetic spectrum. Unlike the previous commissions, it included the proposed “Tobin tax” on foreign currency fluctuations¹⁷, which I had discussed extensively with the late Professor Tobin at Yale and presented to the Commission.¹⁸ (I did the same at meetings in Canada sponsored by the International Development Research Centre (IDRC) and widely attended by government officials, who have examined the proposal more closely and are now among its supporters, and non-governmental organizations (NGOs), which are now its most zealous advocates. Another proposal I made was for a Foreign Currency Exchange (FXE) as a variation on the Tobin tax, which the Commission on Global Governance also included in its publications.¹⁹

Another high-level body was the Independent Working Group on the Future of the United Nations, which was established at the request of the Secretary-General for the fiftieth anniversary of the United Nations, with its secretariat at Yale University’s UN Studies Program.²⁰ While working along different lines, its report, *The United Nations in its Second Half-Century*, noted that “since the United Nations has responsibility for the maintenance of human security in the broadest sense, it is reasonable that it should enjoy income from some sort of levy on the utilization of the global commons.” It suggested consideration of the creation of SDRs “for the purpose of supporting the United Nations ... [which] would be similar in effect to a levy on the commons.”²¹

The 1995 World Summit for Social Development requested relevant United Nations bodies—ECOSOC in particular—to examine “in addition to augmenting the flow of resources through established channels” “new and innovative ideas” for generating funds for development “on a predictable, continuous and assured basis and to offer any useful suggestions”²²

ECOSOC subsequently requested the Secretary-General “to submit a report, to be prepared in cooperation with the United Nations Development Programme, on all aspects of new and innovative ideas for generating funds for globally agreed commitments and priorities, in particular those established at recent United Nations conferences and summits, including in particular a review of their feasibility and possible modalities, as well as the costs and benefits of their implementation; ... consult[ing] and build[ing] upon work of relevant parts of the United Nations system, including the Bretton Woods institutions, and ... drawing upon relevant external expertise from the private and public sectors and the academic community”.²³

The subject of global taxation thus acquired a measure of respectability in official international circles. ECOSOC continued to debate the subject of innovative means of financing, especially global taxation, in subsequent sessions. In 1995 and 1996, Western European representatives to ECOSOC and the Economic and Financial (second) Committee of the General Assembly held meetings with members of the UN Secretariat and among themselves to formulate a strategy to pursue the subject of global taxation and planned more meetings of the Western European delegations.

In a speech at Oxford University in January 1996, then Secretary-General Boutros Boutros-Ghali proposed a surcharge on airline tickets for flights over international air space. The UNDP's Office of Development Studies commissioned a number of papers by eminent economists on the proposed Tobin Tax, which were published for UNDP as a book by Oxford University Press in 1996.²⁴ One was also published separately as an occasional paper.²⁵ Some staff members also wrote in publications or participated in discussions on the subject outside the United Nations.²⁶

Decline

There was a sharp backlash from the US Republican-controlled congress, which was particularly hostile to the UN and was withholding US contributions to the UN's regular and peacekeeping budgets. In January 1996, Senate Majority Leader Bob Dole and Senators Jesse Helms (North Carolina) and Judd Gregg (New Hampshire) threatened to introduce legislation to block all US payments to the UN and asked the US Comptroller General for details on how the UN raises money, how much it has spent “developing, publishing and advocating” revenue-raising proposals, and (shades of the McCarthy era) what role US citizens employed by the UN played in advocating international taxation. ²⁷ In the House of Representatives, fifty congressmen signed a letter to then President Clinton asking him “to join us in publicly denouncing the ... attempt to formulate or enforce a ‘global tax’ on our citizens ... [and] to seek the resignation of U.N. Undersecretary for Humanitarian Affairs, Peter Hansen.”²⁸

These actions had a devastating effect on the idea of global taxation at the United Nations. Hansen, a Danish national, had been Executive Secretary of the

Commission on Global Governance, which, it will be recalled, had dealt with the subject. He had only recently rejoined the UN and appeared at a panel discussion in Washington, D.C., which took up the subject, among others. Then Secretary-General Boutros Boutros-Ghali moved him from New York to Gaza as head of the UN Relief Works Administration (UNRWA) providing humanitarian and economic assistance to the Palestinian refugees. In its 1997 appropriations legislation, the US Congress incorporated restrictions against voluntary contributions should the UN engage in any effort to implement or impose any taxation on any US persons, and this was built in to its agreement with the UN on the payment of its arrears.²⁹ Word circulated at the UN cautioning the staff against advocating or publicly discussing global taxation.

The future

References to global taxation still resurface from time to time. The UNDP-sponsored *Human Development Report* (1999)³⁰ suggested the consideration of a “bit tax”—essentially a tax on Internet e-mail—to raise funds for spreading technology to developing nations. The reaction from the US State Department was swift. On 16 July 1999, Assistant Secretary of State for International Organization Affairs David Welch wrote to the Administrator of UNDP, Mark Malloch Brown, reiterating his government’s strong opposition to any form of international tax and asking for a clarification of the UN’s stance on global taxes. In his letter of the same day, Mr. Malloch Brown responded that “UNDP does not advocate and will never advocate the establishment of this or any other kind of global tax.” He reiterated the UNDP’s public position that the *Human Development Report* is “an independent publication with editorial policies separate from those of UNDP.” He added that he personally considered the idea of a global tax on Internet usage “completely incompatible with the open character of the Internet,” that he had “made my views on this subject crystal clear to all those associated with the preparation of the Human Development Report,” and that he intended “to conduct a thorough review of the editorial process involved in the preparation of this report”.³¹

More recently, the Division for Public Economics and Public Administration of the Department of Economic and Social Affairs, planned a technical meeting on “Innovations in Mobilizing Global Resources for Development,” to take place from 25 to 26 June 2002. It appointed six consultants (including myself) to prepare papers, including the pros and cons of global taxation. A few days before its scheduled start, we were told that the meeting was cancelled on instructions from the office of the Under-Secretary-General for Economic and Social Affairs. The papers, however, were posted on the Web and may be accessed at <http://www.unpan.org/corethemes-papers-on-innovations-LW.asp>

There are proposals for the publication of the papers, but their outcome is not at all certain. It is doubtful that the papers could be issued as a UN publication, which is what the Division has had in mind. I have suggested that

they consider having an academic or commercial publisher issue it instead, with clear disclaimers that the papers represent the views of the authors and not of the United Nations.

At this juncture, the UN is caught in a dilemma. As previously noted, the Copenhagen conference and ECOSOC called for in-depth studies of innovative proposals for financing and asked the UN to prepare a report for the General Assembly. It has been stalled by the US backlash, but the UN is still seized of this responsibility and cannot delay its long overdue report much longer. I understand that Mr. Harris Gleckman and Sir Tony Atkinson, who spoke earlier, and Mr. Harris Gleckman will try to break the logjam. [The UN is contracting the Helsinki-based [World Institute for Development Economics Research \(WIDER\)](#), which is appointing Sir Tony as Project Director] and I look forward to hearing Harris's presentation, which will come next.

The latest major UN event concerning international financing was the International Conference on Financing for Development, which adopted the "Monterrey Consensus" by acclamation on 22 March 2002. I did not expect, and do not see, any non-conventional proposals for international public financing, say along the lines of this meeting, although preparatory papers for the Monterrey Conference, including the "Zedillo report"³², did discuss innovative proposals. Mr. Gleckman, who had a major responsibility for running the Conference and is responsible for its follow-up, will speak on its results and implications. I understand he will explore what "space" there may be for innovative means of financing.

Before I close, I should like to make two further observations:

First, the idea at the UN of global taxation has evolved into a wider concept than the definition of the term *sensu stricto*. Its basis, as I noted at the beginning of my talk, is that of automaticity³³ as contrasted to voluntarism. Thus, charges for the use of the global commons, which could fall under the rubric of "user fees", would be viewed as a form of global taxation. It is one of the innovations of the United Nations Law of the Sea Convention that royalties may be charged for the exploitation of the deep ocean bed, which is deemed to be part of the "common heritage of mankind." Similarly, the Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer is another example of a tax—in this case already being implemented—developed under the auspices of the United Nations: developed countries contribute to a fund in accordance with a scale of assessments that partly reflects their national incomes and the volume of ozone depleting substances they produce. The fund, in turn, is used to assist poor countries in developing and using ozone-friendly technologies. These are clear precedents for global taxation.

Other proposals being considered, such as an SDR-development link and the use of gold sales for international assistance (already applied previously through concessional trust funds by the International Monetary Fund), would not be taxes in the strict sense of the word. They do, however, possess the element of automaticity—as opposed to voluntarism—of taxation. And like taxes, they tap into resource bases and channel part of these resources for public

purposes. In addition to not depending on discretionary, voluntary contributions of governments, what distinguishes these new means of financing from the status quo is that they do not involve intergovernmental transfers of resources—an explosive North-South issue—but rather the tapping of other, global tax or monetary bases to which all humankind collectively has a claim.

Second, despite the opposition of the US and others, I can see industrialized nations with strong environmental lobbies leading the way in the form of Pigovian taxation. As you know, the famous economist A.C. Pigou observed that (roughly) a) private firms generate external costs, such as damage to human health and to the environment, which are not accounted for in their financial accounts; and b) “corrective” taxes or fines (now commonly called “Pigovian” taxes) are a means of “internalizing” these costs—firms are taxed at the level of the damage (costs) they inflict on society and the environment. The taxes or fines act as a disincentive that aims at making them correct their behaviour and also generates revenues for cleanup purposes³⁴, which has aptly been called a “double dividend.” Pigovian taxation need not take the form of conventional taxes, e.g., on income, sales or property. In a number of countries, “permits to pollute” are issued and sold for a price. These permits are thus a form of taxing polluters—of the “polluter pays principle”. There are now national markets in these permits. The Kyoto Protocol considered a similar approach. Although the proposals accepted would apply only to the developed countries, it is likely that there will be agreement to the issuance and allocation of pollution permits among countries. This will lead to their trading in international markets, thus paving the way for a new regime of global taxation.

Notes

1. The UN's first two peacekeeping missions, for Palestine and India/Pakistan, are retained in the regular budget, and certain post-1956 missions are financed entirely or in part from sources other than assessed contributions. Separate special accounts were also established for the international criminal tribunals for Rwanda and the former Yugoslavia using a hybrid of the regular budget and peacekeeping scales of assessment. For a detailed discussion of the UN's financing system and some of its issues, see Mendez, R.P. 1997. "Financing the United Nations and the International Public Sector: Problems and Reform," *Global Governance* 3 (1997) pp. 283-310.
2. *Commodity Trade and Economic Development* (E/2519), Report of a committee appointed by the Secretary-General at the request of General Assembly resolution 623 (VII).
3. A/35/396 17 September 1980. p. 20.
4. *Officials Records of the Economic and Social Council, Forty-ninth Session, Supplement No. 7* (E/4776)
5. *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-first and Thirty-second Sessions* (1975 and 1976) documents A/C.2/31/SR.45 and A/C.2/32/SR.23. The resolution was subsequently withdrawn on condition that the Committee and the Secretary-General "take note" of it. See Steinberg, Eleanor B. and Joseph A. Yager. 1978. *New Means of Financing International Needs*. Washington, D.C.: The Brookings Institution. p. 67. I suspect that Dr. Mostafa K. Tolba, the Egyptian Executive Director of UNEP, suggested the idea of a tax to his friend, Ambassador Jamil Kamal Baroody, Saudi Arabia's Deputy (and acting) Permanent Representative to the UN at the time.
6. GA resolution 3362 (S-VII) of 16 September 1975. This and similar phraseology have been used in various subsequent resolutions.
7. OECD, *The DAC Journal: Development Co-operation; 2001 Report*. Paris: OECD. Volume 3, No. 1. Table 4. Preliminary data for 2001 indicate no change. *OECD in Washington*. No. 38. October-November 2002.

8. UN General Assembly. 1978. *Additional Measures and Means of Financing for the Implementation of the Plan of Action to Combat Desertification*. Issued initially as UNEP document UNEP/GC.6/9/Add. 1 of 4 April 1978, submitted to the General Assembly with a *Note by the Secretary-General*, document symbol A/33/260, 6 October 1978.
9. GA Resolution 33/89.
10. GA Resolution 34/184.
11. UN General Assembly. 1980. *Study on Financing the United Nations Plan of Action to Combat Desertification*. Annexed to the *Report of the Secretary-General* to the General Assembly, document symbol A/35/396, 17 September 1980.
12. UN General Assembly. 1981. *Study on Financing the Plan of Action to Combat Desertification. Annex: Feasibility Studies on and Detailed Modalities for Financing the Plan*. Annexed to the *Report of the Secretary-General* to the General Assembly at its thirty-sixth session. (A/36/141, 1 October 1981)
13. Independent Commission on International Development Issues. 1980. *North-South: A Programme for Survival*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press. pp.125, 244-6.
14. Independent Commission on International Development Issues. 1983. *Common Crisis*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press. pp. 56-8.
15. World Commission on Environment and Development. 1987. *Our Common Future*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. pp. 340-342
16. The Commission was headed by Ingvar Carlsson, former Prime Minister of Sweden, and Shridath Ramphal, Secretary-General of the Commonwealth and former Foreign Minister of Guyana.
17. Commission on Global Governance. 1995. *Our Global Neighbourhood*. New York: Oxford University Press. pp 217-21.
18. Mendez, R.P. 1993. *The Provision and Financing of Universal Public Goods*. London School of Economics, Centre for the Study of Global Governance. Discussion Paper 7 Dec 1993 for a joint meeting of the Commission and the Centre. Subsequently published in updated form as a chapter with the same title in Desai, Mehgnad and Paul Redfern, eds. 1995. *Global Governance: Ethics and Economics of the World Order*, London: Pinter Publishers, 1995. pp. 39-59.
19. *Our Global Neighbourhood*, *op. cit.* pp. 219-20; and Commission on Global Governance. 1995. *Issues in Global Governance*. Amsterdam: Kluwer Law International. pp. 425-441.
20. The Group was headed by Moheen Qureshi, former Prime Minister of Pakistan, and Richard von Weizsäcker, former President of the Federal Republic of Germany.
21. Independent Working Group on the Future of the United Nations. 1995. *The United Nations in its Second Half-Century*. New York: Ford Foundation. Pp.46-7.
22. Report of the World Summit for Social Development (including the Copenhagen Declaration and Programme of Action) A/CONF.166/9
- 23; ECOSOC resolution 1996/48, 52nd plenary meeting, 26 July 1996
24. ul Haq, I. Kaul, and I. Grunberg, eds. 1996. *The Tobin Tax: Coping with Financial Volatility*. New York: Oxford University Press.
25. Felix, David. 1995. *The Tobin Tax Proposal: Background, Issues and Prospects*. New York: UNDP.

26. E.g., D'Orville, Hans and Dragoljub Najman. 1995. *Towards a New Multilateralism: Funding Global Priorities — Innovative Financing Mechanisms for Internationally Agreed Programmes*. Paris/New York, Independent Commission on Population and Quality of Life; Special issue of *Futures — The United Nations: Policy and Financing Alternatives*, by (eds.) Harlan Cleveland, Hazel Henderson and Inge Kaul Washington, DC: The Global Commission to Fund the United Nations, 1995.
27. *The Washington Times* Jan 18, 1996. Also see US General Accounting Office. November 1996. *Report to Congressional Requesters: United Nations; Status of Alternative Revenue Raising Proposals GAO/NSIAD-97-31*. Washington, D.C.
28. Petition containing letters “Dear Colleague” and “Dear Mr. President” dated Jan 4, 1996.
29. Public Law 105-118 (November 26, 1997) Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 1998. “Restrictions on voluntary contributions to United Nations agencies. SEC. 564 (a) Prohibition on voluntary contributions for the United Nations — None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be made available to pay any voluntary contribution of the United States to the United Nations (including the United Nations Development Program) if the United Nations implements or imposes any taxation on any United States persons. (b) Certification required for disbursement of funds—None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available under this Act may be made available to pay any voluntary contribution of the United States to the United Nations (including the United Nations Development Program) unless the President certifies to the Congress 15 days in advance of such payment that the United Nations is not engaged in any effort to implement or impose any taxation on United States persons in order to raise revenue for the United Nations or any of its specialized agencies. (c) definitions—As used in this section the term “United States person” refers to — (1) a natural person who is a citizen or national of the United States; or (2) a corporation, partnership, or other legal entity organized under the United States or any State, territory, possession, or district of the United States.”
30. Published by Oxford University Press. p. 13.
31. US Department of State, Bureau of International Organization Affairs. Press release, July 21, 1999 (http://www.state.gov/gov/www/issues/un_internettax_9907.html). Also see “U.S. Plan for Paying UN Arrears” Fact sheet released by the Bureau of International Organization Affairs U.S. Department of State, October 24, 2000.
32. UN General Assembly, Fifty-fifth session. High-level international intergovernmental consideration of financing for development. (agenda item 101) *Report of the High Level Panel on Financing for Development*. A/55/1000.
33. In reporting on the Security Council debates on Iraq, the *New York Times* (5 November 2002, A14) commented that “During seven weeks of negotiations, France and Russia coined a new term for their objections, saying they did not want ‘automaticity’ for the United States to go to war.” The term, of course, is not new. It is in both English and French dictionaries. For example, *Le petit Robert* (1970) traces its usage to 1933 and that of its synonym, “automatism,” to 1740; and the *Oxford English Dictionary* gives the year of first usage as “187” — a rare mistake probably intended to mean 1887 or earlier. The representatives from the Quai d’Orsay expressed some annoyance and amusement at the *NYT* reporting and were contemplating communicating with their Mission to the UN in New York.
34. Pigou, A[rthur] C. 1918. *The Economics of Welfare*. London: Macmillan