

Brother, can you spare 0.7 per cent of your GDP?

American reporters being what they are - people who do nothing more than repeat talking points handed out by Democrat operatives – it took an Italian magazine to report that Barack Obama’s younger half-brother is living in a slum outside Nairobi. George Hussein Onyango Obama shares a father with Barack, but has a different mother, and says that he lives on “less than a dollar a month.” (His friends allegedly refer to him as “Baroke.”)

George’s older brother Barack, the guy who wants to be our President (or King or Savior or something like that), apparently has spent time with him only twice, once at the age of five, and again in 2006 when he toured Africa and visited Nairobi. The visits didn’t last long, only a few minutes each. Perhaps that second visit (which the Senator called a “painful affair”), left an impression, however, because Obama has since sponsored something called the “Global Poverty Act.” The legislation requires 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 “Millennium Development Goal” of eradicating extreme poverty and hunger is one of eight millennium goals chosen by – you guessed it – the United Nations Millennium Summit. But it looks like the U.N. hasn’t been too successful in reaching its goal, as we’re already further from 1990 than we are close to 2015, and the last time I checked, millions were still starving in places like Somalia. Frankly, it’s surprising that the United Nations hasn’t met its goal of “reducing by one-half” the number of starving people in the world because, after all, even by doing absolutely nothing it might have expected close to half of those people to die.

In the United States Senate, Obama is here doing what he did in the Illinois State Senate – stick his name on a bill after someone else did all the work. In this case he let the United Nations do the heavy lifting, if you can call it that, but Obama also managed to get a few co-sponsors for the bill (Maria Cantwell, Dianne Feinstein, Richard Lugar, Richard Durbin, Chuck Hagel, and Robert Menendez). Five of those names make sense, but Lugar must be getting soft in his old age.

Lyndon Baines Johnson started his “War on Poverty” here at home more than 40 years ago. Since then, the American taxpayer has spent several trillion dollars to end poverty, but throwing money at the problem didn’t do the trick. But because Obama has never shown any reluctance to think big, he’s not limiting himself to ending American poverty, he’s going to tackle global poverty (while generously offering to lower ocean levels at the same time).

What is Obama’s plan for ending global poverty? Throwing money at the problem. Whose money? Yours. How much money? Oh, only about 0.7 per cent of the Gross

Domestic Product of the United States. But that's probably only for starters, if Obama can't do any better on a world scale than did Johnson, Nixon, Ford, Carter, Reagan, Bush, Clinton, and Bush on a national scale.

When the United Nations explained how much money they wanted, Obama simply replied, "No problem," and made sure that his bill included the U.N.'s suggested level of American contributions toward its global effort. America's "fair share" of fighting global poverty would run about \$65 billion *per year*. And that's over and above what the United States already spends on foreign aid (which Obama also wants to double).

That's even more than Obama makes in book royalties (none of which he's offered to contribute to the cause), so one might be tempted to ask where the \$65 billion will come from. The head of the U.N.'s Millennium Project, Jeffrey Sachs, states that the only way to raise that kind of money (America's annual \$65 billion share plus the annual payments from other contributing nations) is through a global tax, possibly on carbon-emitting fossil fuels. It's not clear how Obama is going to lower energy costs for Americans if he's planning on taxing the hell out of fossil fuels, but I'm sure he's working feverishly on that perpetual motion machine he and Al Gore are betting our futures on.

Helping the poor is a worthy cause, of course, but there are many ways to help them. (Capitalism instead of socialism comes to mind.) And voters need to be reminded that championing any cause is easy when it's done with other people's money. The altruistic Senator Obama has often quoted the Bible verse where Jesus said, "Whatever you do for the least of my brothers, you do for me." It certainly seems that George Obama qualifies as one the least of our brothers, but it might be nice if his wealthy half-brother Barack would show some inclination to contribute a few bucks of his own to the cause before demanding that American taxpayers shell out \$65 billion per year to assuage his guilt over leaving the rest of his family suffering in Africa and Indonesia.

Don Fredrick
August 22, 2008