The Historic Africa-led UN Tax Convention
THE DECOLONIZATION OPPORTUNITY OF A LIFETIME

“The ways in which colonialism has altered the course of history will probably never be adequately explored, let alone measured. And the ways in which being colonized affects our attitudes, behaviours, and outcomes, may never be adequately appreciated.

But one of the most worrying and heartbreaking symptoms of our (former) colonization I see in the Caribbean and elsewhere, is the extent and persistence of our collective Stockholm Syndrome that prevents us from making even the simplest and most obvious choices for our own good.

“A UN tax convention is an international agreement that could hold countries to equitable, democratic and legally binding standards on corporate tax, financial transparency and tax justice.” - Tax Justice Network (TJN)

TJN continues - “UN conventions, like the Convention on the Rights of the Child and the Convention against Torture, are international treaties to which countries can sign up and ratify to become bound to the treaty’s provisions in international law.”

The fact that our African sisters and brothers were all able to unite, to champion the UN Tax Convention in an unprecedented effort to release themselves from the shackles of their (former) colonizers - at least for tax governance - is beyond exemplary and inspirational.

Alas - in parts of the Caribbean, Latin America, and the Pacific, our (leaders’) postcolonial PTSD is real. What else could explain this map (below)?

Positions – Where countries stand on the UN tax convention

This map’s North-South distinction clearly and importantly reflects the collective (post)colonial overhang affecting the Caribbean (St. Kitts and Nevis, Suriname, Jamaica, Dominica, St. Vincent and the Grenadines, St. Lucia, Haiti), Latin America (Panama, Honduras, Ecuador, and Venezuela) and the Pacific islands (Tonga, Vanuatu, Samoa, Tuvalu, Kiribati, Nauru, Palau, Marshall Islands, Micronesia). Refer to Table 1 annexed for more details.

What else could possibly explain our underwhelming support for this historic African-championed UN Tax Convention?
IF THE AFRICANS CAN DO IT, WE CAN TOO

“We refuse to be what you wanted us to be.
We are what we are - that’s the way it’s going to be.
if you don’t know...
We’ve been trodding on your winepress much too long.
Rebel! Rebel!
And we’ve been taken for granted much too long.
Rebel!
Got to rebel, y’ all!
The Babylon system is the vampire!
- Babylon System, Bob Marley and the Wailers

The extent to which colonialism’s ghosts haunt us to this day is yet undefined, but they manifest themselves relentlessly.

Perhaps weak institutional and/or human resource capacity and the resulting bureaucratic failures may have led Jamaica, Venezuela and Samoa (one can only hope) to somehow ‘miss’ the opportunity to cast their vote on a humanitarian truce in Gaza and the UN Tax Convention?

Perhaps the all-too-familiar puppet strings of (neo) colonialism explain these countries’ (in)action at the UN on Gaza and their failure to support the UN Tax Convention - Haiti, Kiribati, Marshall Islands, Micronesia, Nauru, Palau, Panama, Tonga, Tuvalu, and Vanuatu?

But I digress.

It shouldn’t surprise anyone that the Global North does not support the UN Tax Convention. After all, the world’s greatest tax haven is the USA (in case you didn’t click in the first paragraph of this article to check). And the European Union (EU) and its vassal Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) (based in a castle in Paris, purchased from the Rothschild family, no less) are consistently and unambiguously against financial transparency and tax justice, because it is in their interest to continue to successfully pursue their financial secrecy and tax havenry, alongside their hypocritical and racist, indefensible smear campaign against lesser competitors.

But the Caribbean and the Pacific’s lack of support for the UN Tax convention equates to our (continued) support for the OECD’s global tax governance. Is that what we really meant to do?

“My people, oh my people, keep your head on at all times!
Understand-up and be counted!
Understand-up and be counted, and send a message!”
- The Ganges and the Nile, David Rudder

YOU HAD ONE JOB

“Since the G20 declared the end of banking secrecy in 2009, the international community has achieved great success in the fight against offshore tax evasion. Working through the Global Forum, countries and jurisdictions have implemented robust standards that have prompted an unprecedented level of transparency in tax matters. With 168 members, the Global Forum on Transparency and Exchange of Information for Tax Purposes is the leading international body working on the implementation of global transparency and exchange of information standards around the world.” - OECD

Today, the OECD, with a mere 38 member countries, is the only institution that almost the whole world relies on, by default, for global tax governance.

How has the OECD performed, in its crucial role as overseer of global tax governance?

One would expect that with 168 members of its Global Forum on Transparency and Exchange of Information for Tax Purposes, its “robust standards”, and its “unprecedented transparency”, of course the OECD’s efforts have been a resounding success. N’est-ce pas?

“For the past sixty years, global tax rules have been set by the OECD, a small club of rich countries, some of which rank as the world’s most harmful tax havens. Analysis shows that OECD countries are responsible for enabling three-fourths of these tax losses” - TJN (2023)
“A club of rich countries determining global rules on corporate tax are responsible for over two-thirds of global corporate tax abuse...the OECD, a membership organisation made up of high income countries and the world’s leading rule-maker on international tax, failed to detect and prevent corporate tax abuse enabled by the OECD’s own member countries – and in some cases, pushed countries to rollback their tax transparency.” - TJNI (2021)

“OECD pressed Australia to drop plan to reveal where multinationals pay tax” - FT

“Letter: OECD’s lobbying points to failure on fair corporate taxation” Joseph Stiglitz and Jayati Ghosh

“The OECD has not delivered. The world needs an answer now, not further delays” - ICRICT

“The OECD has produced a deal that has strong biases towards the interests of larger and richer countries, at the expense of the world’s poorest countries.” - EURODAD

“Open letter to G20: OECD failure to deliver on G20 mandates” - TJN

“An assessment of the G20/ OECD BEPS outcomes: Failing to reach its objectives” - EURODAD

“A bad deal for development: Assessing the impacts of the new inclusive framework tax deal on low- and middle-income countries” - Brookings

“The OECD’s proposed reform will fail to generate meaningful additional tax revenue, especially for developing countries” - ICRICT

“Oxfam criticizes ‘toothless’ OECD Tax Package” - Oxfam

“More evidence of the OECD’s failure to stop tax abuse” - Financial Transparency Coalition

“The Questionable Legitimacy of the OECD/G20 BEPS Project” - Erasmus Law Review

“The EU and OECD have come under attack for failing to solve digital tax just as the US is preparing new sanctions.” - ITR

“The OECD has not delivered on global tax reform” - Public Services International

“You can fool some people sometimes, But you can’t fool all the people all the time. Now you see the light. So stand up for your rights! - Get up Stand up, Bob Marley and the Wailers

WHY A UN TAX CONVENTION?

“For the past century, global tax rules have been set by a small club of rich countries at the OECD, some of which rank as the world’s most harmful tax havens. The outcome is tax rules that fail to stop, and sometimes even encourage, tax injustice. Establishing a UN tax convention will give all countries a say on global tax rules through a democratic, inclusive intergovernmental body under the UN, and will introduce global tax rules that must adhere to the UN’s human rights principles” - TJN

First of all, why not? The only arguments against the UN taking on the role of global tax governance so far, center around the risk of UN bureaucracy and ineffectiveness. But the OECD itself, which already has all the power and authority it needs to address global tax injustice and tax evasion, is itself responsible for three-fourths of the world’s global tax losses, and has failed to address these problems as outlined earlier (likely because it will prove harmful to its own members).

The OECD comically boasts that its “Voluntary disclosure programmes, offshore tax investigations and related measures have generated close to EUR26 billion in additional revenues so far” - an unimpressive one-quarter of the estimated USD483 billion lost to tax evasion annually.
And assuming “so far” means over the past decade and with the cooperation of 168 countries, the OECD is proud to report that its efforts have yielded a whopping 2.6% of global tax losses!!

Evidently, the OECD has set the bar quite low for effectiveness, and indeed, it is hard to imagine a more abysmal outcome (assuming they were even trying). I am confident the United Nations will do better.

It is instructive that the only Latin American countries that are members of the OECD - Chile, Colombia and Mexico - are also the only OECD members that are Leaders on the UN Tax Convention. They would be more familiar with the inner workings of the OECD, perhaps hence their leading position on the UN Tax Convention.

For an issue so ubiquitous as tax, so powerful as fiscal policy, so unnecessarily dominated by the Global North as tax governance, and so enigmatic as tax justice, the United Nations at least presents the real possibility of inclusivity, fairness, and transparency. Don’t forget - the OECD by design will always seek the interests of its 38 member countries, even at the expense of the rest of the world, and it is heavily incentivized to do so.

Indeed, the Global South, and more specifically, the Caribbean and Pacific Islands are the most ‘assessed’ by the OECD. And supposedly on the basis of the OECD peer rating, the EU blacklists only predominantly non-white countries (apart from Russia in February 2023), mostly from the Caribbean and the Pacific. And according to EU methodology, appearing on one EU blacklist makes it more likely that we will appear on the other.

According to OECD’s peer review ratings dashboard, the countries which have been subjected to the most peer reviews, having had 4 peer reviews each, are:

- **Barbados** - Supporter of the UN Tax Convention, deemed ‘Largely Compliant’ by the OECD, and is AML/CFT blacklisted by the EU.

The countries which have had 3 OECD peer reviews each:

- **Andorra** - Opposer, deemed ‘Largely Compliant’ by the OECD
- **Anguilla** - Not Applicable, deemed ‘Partially Compliant’ by the OECD, and Tax Blacklisted by the EU
- **Antigua and Barbuda** - Supporter, deemed ‘Partially Compliant’ by the OECD, and Tax Blacklisted by the EU
- **Austria** - Blocker, deemed ‘Largely Compliant’ by the OECD
- **Botswana** - Leader, deemed ‘Largely Compliant’ by the OECD
- **British Virgin Islands** - Not Applicable, deemed ‘Partially Compliant’ by the OECD
- **Costa Rica** - Partial Supporter, deemed ‘Largely Compliant’ by the OECD
- **Curaçao** - Not Applicable, deemed ‘Largely Compliant’ by the OECD
- **Cyprus** - Blocker, deemed ‘Largely Compliant’ by the OECD
- **Dominican Republic** - Supporter, deemed ‘Largely Compliant’ by the OECD
- **Guatemala** - Supporter, deemed ‘Non-Compliant’ by the OECD
- **Israel** - Opposer, deemed ‘Largely Compliant’ by the OECD
- **Jamaica** - No Public Position, deemed ‘Largely Compliant’ by the OECD, and is AML/CFT blacklisted by the EU
- **Jersey** - Not Applicable, deemed ‘Compliant’ by the OECD
- **Luxembourg** - Blocker, deemed ‘Largely Compliant’ by the OECD

---

1“The OECD, a club of rich countries that has set global tax rules for the past sixty years, was mandated by the G20 in 2013 to reform global tax rules to stop multinational corporations from shifting profit into tax havens and underpaying tax. A decade later, the OECD has yet to deliver any significant progress.”

Marshall Islands - No Public Position, deemed ‘Largely Compliant’ by the OECD

Panama - Opposer, deemed ‘Partially Compliant’ by the OECD, is Tax Blacklisted by the EU, and AML/CFT Blacklisted by the EU

St. Lucia - No Public Position, deemed ‘Largely Compliant’ by the OECD

Samoa - Not Applicable, deemed ‘Largely Compliant’ by the OECD, but is Tax Blacklisted by the EU

United Arab Emirates - Supporter, deemed ‘Largely Compliant’ by the OECD, and is AML/CFT Blacklisted by the EU

To support the OECD, is to implicitly support the EU and its indefensible, racist and hypocritical blacklisting of non-white former colonies, especially in the Caribbean and Pacific Islands. Again, is that what we really meant to do?

Furthermore, and finally, apart from the fact that the OECD is a failure as it relates to global tax governance and by design is not concerned with the needs of non-members particularly in the Global South, the Caribbean and the Pacific islands MUST support the UN Tax Convention, lest we continue to enslave ourselves to our (former) colonizers in the EU and OECD. To do otherwise, and not support the UN Tax Convention unequivocally, only proves that we are not yet ready for decolonization, that we are unable to free ourselves of the puppeteer’s strings, or to think for ourselves and vote independently.

As such, I call on the Governments of St. Kitts and Nevis and Suriname who have for whatever reason opposed the UN Tax Convention, to please reconsider their rather regressive position. I also call on the Governments of Dominica, St. Vincent and the Grenadines, St. Lucia, Jamaica and Haiti to indicate their support for the UN Tax Convention. Show the world that you can stand up to injustice, further your decolonization journey, and break free of the OECD. It’s now or never.

“That’s just the way it is. Some things will never change. That’s just the way it is. Ha, but don’t you believe them!
- The Way It Is, Bruce Hornsby and the Range
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BLOCKERS</th>
<th>OPPOSERS</th>
<th>PARTIAL SUPPORTERS</th>
<th>SUPPORTERS</th>
<th>LEADERS</th>
<th>NO PUBLIC POSITION</th>
<th>NOT APPLICABLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Have consistently taken active steps to block progress on the policy at an international or national level, or both</td>
<td>Have expressed opposition to progress on the policy at an international or national level, or both, but the country’s actions have not consistently aligned with this support</td>
<td>Consistently support progress on the policy at an international or national, or both levels, but the country’s actions have not consistently aligned with this support</td>
<td>Consistently take active steps to advance the policy at an international, or national, or both levels (global median)</td>
<td>Consistently take active steps to advance the policy at an international, or national, or both levels (which include all the African states)</td>
<td>Have not expressed support or opposition to the policy, despite opportunities to do so</td>
<td>Non-sovereign territories which are not themselves UN members and therefore unable to vote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Iceland</td>
<td>Costa Rica</td>
<td>Antigua and Barbuda</td>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>Dominica</td>
<td>American Samoa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>Barbados</td>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>Haiti</td>
<td>Anguilla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>Jamaica</td>
<td>Arabia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>Cuba</td>
<td>Algeria</td>
<td>Kiribati</td>
<td>Bermuda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>Federal States of Micronesia</td>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>Dominica Republic</td>
<td>Angola</td>
<td>Marshall Islands</td>
<td>British Virgin Islands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>Saint Kitts and Nevis</td>
<td>Bhutan</td>
<td>Fiji</td>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>resume</td>
<td>Cayman Islands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>Suriname</td>
<td>El Salvador</td>
<td>Grenada</td>
<td>Bolivia</td>
<td>Palau</td>
<td>Guam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>Albania</td>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>Bhutan Free</td>
<td>Saint Lucia</td>
<td>South</td>
<td>Saint Vincent and the Grenadines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>Andorra</td>
<td>Uruguay</td>
<td>Papua New Guinea</td>
<td>Burundi</td>
<td>Saint Vincent and the Grenadines</td>
<td>Montserrat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td>Slovakia Islands</td>
<td>Cameroon</td>
<td>Somalia</td>
<td>Puerto Rico</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Britain</td>
<td>Honduras</td>
<td>The Bahamas</td>
<td>Cape Verde</td>
<td>Tonga</td>
<td>Turks and Caicos Islands</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>Trinidad and Tobago</td>
<td>Central African Republic</td>
<td>Tuvalu</td>
<td>United States Virgin Islands</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>Panama</td>
<td>Chad</td>
<td>Yemen</td>
<td>Turks</td>
<td>Cook Islands</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Bolivia</td>
<td>Cameroon</td>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>Gibraltar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>Armenia</td>
<td>Guernsey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>-Israel</td>
<td>Armenia</td>
<td>Armenia</td>
<td>Guernsey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>Portugal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>Belize</td>
<td>Isle of Man</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>East Timor</td>
<td>Equatorial Guinea</td>
<td>Cambodia</td>
<td>Brunei</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>Guatemala</td>
<td>El Salvador</td>
<td>Turkmenistan</td>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>Equatorial Guine</td>
<td>Cambodia</td>
<td>Brunei</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>Gabon</td>
<td>Guineabissau</td>
<td>Guinea</td>
<td>Guinea</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovak Republic</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>Guinea</td>
<td>Guinea</td>
<td>Guinea</td>
<td>Guinea</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>Kosovo</td>
<td>Guatemala</td>
<td>Guatemala</td>
<td>Guatemala</td>
<td>Guatemala</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>South Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>Ivory Coast</td>
<td>Ivory Coast</td>
<td>Ivory Coast</td>
<td>Ivory Coast</td>
<td>Ivory Coast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>Jordan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunisia</td>
<td>Mongolia</td>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>Egypt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>Nepal</td>
<td>Liberia</td>
<td>Liberia</td>
<td>Liberia</td>
<td>Liberia</td>
<td>Liberia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>Sudan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>Philippines</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Source: Tax Justice Network, Marla Dukharan.