

Report

C|A|S|I|N

The Gleneagles Summit

NGO and Civil society Perspectives on the G8

August 2005

Karin Simonson
Ottawa, Canada

Programme on NGOs & Civil Society

Centre for Applied Studies in International Negotiations
Centre d'études pratiques de la négociation internationale

<p>C A S I N</p>	
<p>Centre for Applied Studies in International Negotiations C.P. 1340 Av. de la Paix 7 bis 1211 Geneva 1 Switzerland</p> <p>T +41 22 730 8675/76 F +41 22 730 8690 ngocasin@casin.ch www.casin.ch</p>	<p>Karin Simonson, Research Associate, prepared this report for the Programme on NGOs and Civil Society of the Centre for Applied Studies in International Negotiation.</p> <p>The Programme on NGOs and Civil Society Worldwide, the role of civil society has been increasing at rapid speed. Non-governmental organizations (NGOs) have become significant and influential players and generate much interest. Created in 1986, the Programme on Non-Governmental Organizations and Civil Society aims at contributing towards a better understanding of NGOs and the solutions of complex and conflictive societal problems involving NGOs.</p> <p>The opinions expressed in this paper reflect only those of the author and not of the institutions to which he/she is or was affiliated.</p> <p>Copyright CASIN © August 2005</p>

Table of Contents

SUMMARY.....	1
INTRODUCTION.....	2
BACKGROUND ON G8.....	2
G8 GLENEAGLES.....	3
Official Participants.....	3
Civil Society Actors.....	3
Location.....	5
Security.....	6
The Backdrop for Discussion.....	8
The Gleneagles Agenda.....	10
NGO & Civil Society Expectations.....	12
ALTERNATIVE EVENTS.....	20
OFFICIAL OUTCOMES.....	43
NGO AND CIVIL SOCIETY RESPONSES.....	47
CONCLUDING THOUGHTS.....	61
DIRECTIONS FOR THE FUTURE.....	62
PHOTO GALLERY.....	63
APPENDIX A GLOBAL DECLARATION OF COMMON SECURITY.....	74
APPENDIX B MAKEPOVERTYHISTORY.....	79
APPENDIX C CHAIR'S SUMMARY, GLENEAGLES SUMMIT, 8 JULY.....	82
APPENDIX D MAKE POVERTY HISTORY RESPONSE TO G8 COMMUNIQUE.....	86
APPENDIX E JOINT STATEMENT FROM AFRICAN CIVIL SOCIETY ORGANISATIONS AT THE CONCLUSION OF THE 2005 SUMMIT, GLENEAGLES, SCOTLAND JULY 6-8 TH	89

SUMMARY

From July 6th to 8th, 2005, the luxury golf course and hotel at Gleneagles, Scotland hosted the annual summit of leaders of the eight most powerful countries in the world. Chaired by UK Prime Minister Tony Blair, this year's summit set an ambitious agenda: addressing the problems of Africa's development and tackling global climate change.

With 2005 also deemed the year to "Make Poverty History" (MPH), a major civil society campaign was launched targeting the G8 summit. Combining flashy advertisements, trendy white wristbands, and celebrity spokespeople, the Make Poverty History campaign pressed the G8 for action on three main issues: debt relief, increased aid, and trade justice. Together with the star-studded Live 8 concerts, held in 10 cities around the world, the campaign and its message was broadcast into the homes of millions, capturing the public's attention and heightening expectations for change.

As in the past, this year's official summit was met with widespread opposition. However, no longer just a single 'counter-summit', this year's resistance included an alternative eco-village, an army of anarchist circus clowns, a group of rebel golfers, a Carnival for Full Enjoyment, various youth summits and alternative workshops, and many marches, blockades, and demonstrations. Aside from a few skirmishes between protesters and police and some minor property damage, the events were relatively peaceful.

Amidst the diversity of voices protesting the G8, many were unified in their message: aid, trade, debt relief, and action on climate change. Where tensions did flare, however, was over how to present this message to the public. While some groups felt that the MPH campaign and Live 8 concerts brought much needed attention to the issues, others felt that this over-simplified the problems. Others resisted the participation of politicians in the campaigns, fearing that they would try to undermine or weaken it. Issues of representation and co-optation also proved problematic, with NGOs sometimes clashing over public statements and accusing each other of stealing the stage.

However, fears that the summit would be 'hijacked' by any particular group quickly faded when a series of terrorist bombs exploded in London. As the media and global attention shifted away from Gleneagles, groups were left on their own to evaluate the final communiqué. Widespread consensus among campaigners was that the pledges amounted to "too little, too late". Despite the enormous build-up to the summit and campaigners high hopes for change, many were left feeling disappointed, if not betrayed.

For many civil society groups, their sights now set on the next two targets of the 2005: the UN Summit in September and the WTO Ministerial in December. Given the failure of the G8 to "Make Poverty History", however, the challenge ahead remains a daunting one.

INTRODUCTION

This paper is intended to reflect the opinions and perspectives of non-governmental organisations and civil society organisations regarding the 2005 G8 summit. It is not intended to serve as a comprehensive summary of what took place or which groups were present, but rather, to provide an idea of some of the main events and issues.

Wherever possible, I have attempted to provide the links to the articles and websites I have referenced or which I believe may be of interest.

BACKGROUND ON G8

The history of the Group of Eight can be traced back to 1975 when French President Giscard d'Estaing invited the leaders of the most powerful countries at the time—Germany, Italy, Japan, the United States, and the United Kingdom—to a three-day summit at the presidential palace in Rambouillet, France. According to d'Estaing, the aim of this first meeting was to discuss the global economy, and in particular, fluctuating oil prices, financial instability, and the effects of the Vietnam War, in order to provide 'global stability' for the benefit of all. In 1976, the group decided to meet annually, adding Canada to its list of invitees. Following the collapse of the Soviet Union, the Group of Seven, or G7 as it had come to be known, extended an invitation to Russia as well, thus forming the G8 (Canada, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, the United States, and the United Kingdom, and Russia).

Although the first summits focussed mainly on economic policies, the G8 has since expanded its focus to include a range of political and social issues such as HIV/AIDS, debt, universal primary education, climate change, and terrorism. As its focus and influence have expanded, however, so too has resistance to the G8.

Unlike other international institutions, critics point out that the G8 is not elected, has no constitution or charter, no permanent headquarters, and keeps no minutes or formal records of its meetings—many of which take place behind closed doors. Beyond the official communiqué issued at the end of each summit, little is actually known about the decision-making processes. And, given that these eight men representing only 12 percent of the total population, are seen to be taking decisions on behalf of the remaining 88 percent of the world, it is not surprising that many protesters have deemed the G8 an elitist and illegitimate group.

Moreover, with the enormous economic, military, and diplomatic strength of the G8's members, as well as their influence over major 'global' institutions such as the World Bank, the IMF, the UN Security Council, and the WTO, the G8 has become a major focal point of protest. Beginning in Birmingham in 1998 with the drop the debt campaign protests, the annual G8 summits have been met with large-scale protests, most notably, the violent clashes with police in Genoa in

2001 (which resulted in the police shooting of protester Carlo Giuliani) and the summit in Evian in 2003 (which resulted in widespread damage of neighbouring Geneva). As a result, the G8 has taken to meeting in increasingly remote locations with the tightest of security, only further reinforcing the G8's 'closed door' image.

G8 GLENEAGLES

Official Participants

In addition to the G8 members, Gleneagles also hosted the leaders of seven African countries (Algeria, Ethiopia, Ghana, Nigeria, Senegal, South Africa, and Tanzania) and the four 'emerging economic powers' (Brazil, China, India, Mexico, and South Africa).

Additionally, the United Nations Secretary General Kofi Annan, heads of the World Trade Organisation and the International Energy Agency, the President of the World Bank, the Managing Director of the International Monetary Fund, and the Chairperson of the Commission of the African Union were in attendance. The Queen of England also attended selected special events, most notably the welcome reception dinner.

NGOs and civil society organisations were invited to participate in an "extensive programme of dialogue", both in the run-up to and during the summit. Media and security delegations were also present at Gleneagles.¹

Civil Society Actors

The Make Poverty History campaign

The Make Poverty History campaign is part of the Global Call to Action Against Poverty (GCAP), a global action launched at the World Social Forum in Porto Alegre, Brazil in January 2005. Around the world, hundreds of NGOs, civil society groups, faith-based groups, trade unions, celebrities, and others have united behind the call to "Make Poverty History" through trade justice, more and better aid, and debt cancellation. Solidarity groups exist in several other countries, including the UK, Canada, Ireland, and Australia. The campaign also featured a slick, celebrity-based advertising campaign, a virtual protest site with more than 50 000 cyber activists, a guide on how to lobby G8 leaders and MPs on related activities throughout the year, a trendy white wristband campaign, and more.²

Dissent!

The Dissent! Network was formed in the autumn of 2003 when members of radical ecological direct action groups, Peoples' Global Action (PGA), the anti-war movement, and the global anti-capitalist movement joined forces. The network has no central office, no spokespeople, no membership list and no paid staff and sees itself as a mechanism for communication and co-

¹ For further information, please visit www.g8.gov.uk

² For further information, please visit www.makepovertyhistory.org, www.whiteband.org, and www.g8rally.com.

ordination between local groups and working groups involved in building resistance to the G8, and capitalism in general. The network advocates a direct action and confrontational approach to the G8 summit.³

As publication SchNEWS describes the rationale behind such groups: “To hell with being led like sheep on pointless ‘demos’ listening to inane politicians telling us what they think we want to hear. Change and justice will come when we get together as equals and take up the tools of direct action. This is the true meaning of democracy, not a cross in a box every four years. It’s our world and we want it back.”⁴

G8 Alternatives

G8 Alternatives is a coalition that includes organisations and individuals from a broad range of social movements that combined their efforts in planning and organising large-scale peaceful protests and counter-summit activities. G8 Alternatives supporters include: Centre for Human Ecology, Dundee Trade Union Council, Edinburgh CND, Edinburgh Stop the War Coalition, Freeequal (conscious clubbers), Ethical Company Organisation, Friends of the Earth Scotland, Glasgow Campaign to Welcome Refugees, Globalise Resistance Scotland, GOOSHING, Iraq Occupation Focus, Justice Not Vengeance, Muslim Association of Britain, NUJ Glasgow, Scotland Against Criminalising Communities, Scottish CND, Scottish Human Rights Centre, Scottish Socialist Party, Scottish Socialist Youth, Spinwatch, Stirling University Anti-War Group, TGWU 7/151 Branch, TGWU Glasgow District, World Development Movement Scotland, YWCA Scotland, as well as individual supporters.⁵

The ONE campaign

With similar objectives to the Make Poverty History campaign, the ONE campaign declarations states: “We believe that in the best American tradition of helping others help themselves, now is the time to join with other countries in a historic pact for compassion and justice to help the poorest people of the world overcome AIDS and extreme poverty. We recognise that a pact including such measures as fair trade, debt relief, fighting corruption and directing an additional one percent of the U.S. budget toward meeting basic needs – education, health, clean water, food, and care for orphans – would transform the futures and hopes of an entire generation in the poorest countries. We commit ourselves - one person, one voice, one vote at a time - to make a better, safer world for all.”

The ONE campaign was founded by Bread for the World, CARE, DATA, International Medical Corps, International Rescue Committee, Mercy Corps, Oxfam America, Plan USA, Save the Children US, World Concern, and World Vision, and works closely with the National Basketball Association, Rock the Vote, and the Millennium Campaign. The ONE Campaign is supported by Bill and Melinda Gates and the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation.⁶

³ For further information, please visit: www.dissent.org.uk

⁴ SchNEWS. G8 Special. July 1, 2005.

⁵ For further information, please visit: www.g8alternatives.org.uk

⁶ For further information, please visit: www.one.org

People's Golfing Association

The People's Golfing Association (PGA) plays on the acronyms of the Professional Golfers' Association and People's Global Action. The group, loosely associated with other anarchists groups such as the Dissent! network and DIST (Deconstructionist Institute for Surreal Topology), a group claiming to specialise in Revolutionary Studies and the advancement of Applied Autonomy, encouraged protesters to join in direct action against the G8 on the Gleneagles golf course.⁷

Clandestine Insurgent Rebel Circus Army (CIRCA)

One of the intriguing and most media-grabbing groups at this year's summit was CIRCA. The Clandestine Insurgent Rebel Circus Army (CIRCA) considers its task to "reclaim the art of Rebel Clowning" and "make clowning dangerous again" by bringing it back to the street as a form of non-violent disobedience and fun and creative protest.⁸ When asked whether the group was "anarchist" in nature, Kolonel Klepto, a clown, answered: "Some are, but most would consider themselves 'horizontalists', where we engage people without the need for leaders."

CIRCA's Operation HAAAAHA (Helping Authorities House Arrest Half-witted Authoritarian Androids), their special 'G8 operation', called on its members to do "everything we can to help the security forces keep the G8 under indefinite house arrest (or rather luxury hotel arrest)." Based out of the solar-powered caravan called the 'Laboratory of Insurrectionary Imagination', Kolonel Klepto called out to protesters to "use non-violent direct action to protest against the co-option of the anti-poverty movement by people like Gordon Brown." CIRCA member 'General Anaesthetic' also encouraged all activists to join the G8 protests in solidarity with "nonsense, noses and naughtiness" in the quest for a "less stupid world without war on people or the planet".⁹

Celebrities

This year's summit also featured the involvement of a number of celebrity personalities. Of these, the most notable were former Boomtown Rats singer and Live Aid organiser Bob Geldof and U2 singer and political activist Bono, who organised the massive Live 8 concerts held around the world on July 2, 2005. A number of other celebrities were also involved in the Live 8 concerts, and also in the Make Poverty History television advertisements.

Location

This year's G8 summit took place at the Gleneagles Hotel, near Auchterarder, Scotland. Gleneagles, a location synonymous with golf, is considered one of the finest courses in the world and a place where the rich and famous congregate in luxury and splendour. This glamorous image, however, combined with the fact that the Hotel is owned by "alco-pop" drinks multinational Diageo, led to criticism from NGOs and activists that the summit was both too elite as well as too open to corporate influence.¹⁰

⁷ For further information, please visit: <http://www.tao.ca/~wrench/dist/g8/pga.html>

⁸ For further information, please visit: www.clownarmy.org

⁹ Edinburgh Evening News. "Rebel clowns are in town". June 30, 2005.

¹⁰ Corporate Watch. "The G8 Summit: Better living through corporate rule?" June/July 2005. Diageo has been accused by Corporate Watch of forcing products into the African market, undermining labour rights, and aggressively lobbying for free trade.

Security

It was feared by organisers that this year's summit would be the target of a wide range of groups, including "anti-capitalists, the Irish Republican Army, al-Qaeda, and Chechen rebels," among others.¹¹ As a result, organisers spent more than 18 months planning the event and approximately £100 million to secure the area.¹² The effort involved more than 10 000 police officers, 6 000 of which were brought in from England and Wales and another 4 000 from other parts of Scotland.¹³ Additionally, more than 2 500 security vehicles, 200 police dogs, 60 horses, and a 'heat-seeking dirigible' were used to spot security breaches of the summit site.¹⁴ A six-foot high, six-mile long double steel fence was also constructed around the perimeter of the Gleneagles Hotel.¹⁵ The fence, dubbed the "biggest barrier in Scotland since Hadrian's Wall", was designed to prevent protesters from coming any closer than 500m to the Gleneagles Hotel.¹⁶

Despite their best efforts, however, details of "Operation Sorbus", the security plan for the G8, were leaked to The Independent in advance of the summit, leading to widespread criticism of both the lax security measures as well as the enormous cost of the effort. As a result, irritated Scots suggested that the G8 would have been better off to have "met on an aircraft carrier in the middle of the ocean—in the cheaper and more honest armed isolation that would best represent their relationship to the public."¹⁷

Local residents, forced to carry identity cards to access their homes and neighbourhoods, were unimpressed with the security measures. Some residents complained that the police were 'fear-mongering' among local residents. As Maureen Connor, a local resident explained, "We had been a bit frightened by what might have happened. We have heard so many stories about anarchists. But they all looked like angels." Another resident said, "You would think that the whole of al-Qaeda was coming", while others commented, "There's far too many bloody police. There's enough for one person each, yet you'll never find one when you want them usually".¹⁸

Protesters were also angry about the tight security measures and feared they would be denied the right to protest near the summit. Gill Hubbard, a representative of G8 Alternatives, argued, "We want to walk right past the hotel...There's no point in demonstrating if they can't hear us and see us. We want them to know there are a lot of people unhappy about their strategies. If we were denied the right to protest, it would be a massive civil liberties issue".¹⁹ George Galloway, RESPECT MP and protest leader also rejected the police's orders to not protest near the Summit site and promised he would lead activists as close as he possibly could to the location, arguing

¹¹ The Sunday Herald. "2000 police, ID cards for 500 locals, and a ring of steel: welcome to Fortress Gleneagles". May 15, 2005.

¹² The Guardian. "Under siege, the small town with a world view—and big fears". July 6, 2005.

¹³ BBC. "G8 police influx swells numbers". July 3, 2005.

¹⁴ The Guardian. "Under siege, the small town with a world view—and big fears". July 6, 2005.

¹⁵ The Guardian. "Under siege, the small town with a world view—and big fears". July 6, 2005.

¹⁶ Forbes. "G8 activists go online". July 5, 2005.

¹⁷ AlterNet. "Measuring victory". July 26, 2005.

¹⁸ The Guardian. "Under siege, the small town with a world view—and big fears". July 6, 2005.

¹⁹ The Sunday Herald. "2000 police, ID cards for 500 locals, and a ring of steel: welcome to Fortress Gleneagles". May 15, 2005.

that the right to demonstrate was “non-negotiable” and warning of ‘chaos’ if marchers were denied it.²⁰

Henri, a camper at the Stirling Eco-village also exclaimed, “This is a display of power, completely disproportionate to the threat posed...Why does the British want to make it seem that anyone who goes on this legitimate march is a terrorist? Everyone knows that the world’s greatest terrorist is George Bush”.

Protesters also complained that police used excessive photography during marches, that security forces boarding buses and searched bags, and that some police forces deliberately misled several buses of protesters to believe that marches had been cancelled when, in fact they had not, in order to remove them from the area. Activists were also outraged when, in advance of the summit, police seized several Indymedia servers, as they had done in Genoa in 2001 and London in 2004, prior to the European Social Forum. This led to a cry of outrage from the National Union of Journalists, Liberty, Statewatch, Campaign against Criminalising Communities, International Federation of Journalists, Reporters sans Frontieres, Privacy International, and others.²¹

However, the police maintained that their response to the security threat was nothing but proportional. With protesters carrying maps, mobile phones, two-way radios, GPS devices, and pagers, security forces claimed they faced a new level of technological sophistication among protesters. And, while protesters themselves claimed that they are now better able to inform others of police presence, capture arrests and upload them onto the Internet in real time, blog and report on every aspect of what takes place, the security forces claim this justified their tight control over the Summit.²² Assistant Chief Constable Ian Dickinson of Lothian and Borders Police stated, “We have a long and successful tradition of overseeing marches, demonstrations and other high-profile events in a sensitive manner and enabling protest groups to make their point without having to resort to conflict...We welcome people who wish to take part but will not tolerate anti-social behaviour or criminal disorder”.²³

Despite complaints, however, in the follow-up to the summit many protesters noted in blogs and informal accounts that they too felt that the police response was relatively calm, if not sometimes disorganised and haphazard. Some blogs mentioned that the police often seemed to want to avoid violent confrontation with protesters, seeking only to contain them and search for weapons while others noted that if the summit had taken place in any other country, the response would have been much tougher.²⁴

²⁰ Scotland Today. “G8 protesters warn of disorder unless march ban is lifted”. June 23, 2005.

²¹ Inter-Press Service. “As bloggers will see it”. June 28, 2005.

²² Forbes. “G8 activists go online”. July 5, 2005.

²³ BBC. “Thousands flock to poverty march.” July 2, 2005.

²⁴ Indymedia UK. “The anti-authoritarians’ story: this is how we do it”. July 12, 2005.

The Backdrop for Discussion

Given the widely held belief that 2005 would be the year for sweeping change and a unique opportunity to make serious progress on the Millennium Development Goals, the pressure on G8 leaders to provide ‘real outcomes’ was immense. While Blair promoted the 2005 summit as the “year of decision”, there remained considerable differences in opinion over the two key summit issues: climate change and Africa. In the lead up to the summit, it became apparent that Germany, Italy, and Canada did not want to be forced into increasing foreign aid and there were suspicions that, if Germany and/or Italy were to increase their aid, it could be part of an attempt to secure a position on the UN Security Council as part of the upcoming reforms.²⁵

In advance of the summit discussions, old tensions over the war in Iraq, as well as the Bush administrations’ refusal to sign the Kyoto Protocol also flared. Bush and Blair seemed poised to clash on agricultural policies as well, both outlining their refusal to make the first move, even before summit discussions began.²⁶ And although not directly related, there were speculations that Chirac may have ‘tender feelings’ following London’s success over Paris for Olympic bid, and hints that Chirac’s disparaging remarks about British food signalled a growing rift between the two countries.²⁷ As the summit neared, in spite of the optimism of activists and campaigners, it was also widely expected that there would be little movement on the key issue of trade, particularly given the state of WTO trade negotiations in Geneva.

However, during the G8 Finance Ministers’ Meetings in June 2005, it appeared as though breakthroughs could be made on certain issues. The finance ministers agreed that the World Bank, the IMF, and the African Development Bank should immediately exempt the 18 poorest countries of US \$40 billion worth of debt as part of the Highly-Indebted Poor Countries (HIPC) initiative. The deal, which affects Benin, Bolivia, Burkina Faso, Ethiopia, Ghana, Guyana, Honduras, Madagascar, Mali, Mauritania, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Niger, Rwanda, Senegal, Tanzania, Uganda, Zambia, was hailed by many debt campaigners as somewhat of a success.²⁸ Moreover, by inviting Brazil, Russia, India, China to participate in the discussions, some felt that the G8 had finally recognised that its exclusive nature was no longer appropriate and that the “new force pushing forward the development of the global economy [Brazil, Russia, India, and China]...can no longer be ignored”.²⁹ Despite the G8’s progress on aid and debt, however, many feared that climate change and trade would continue to be the major stumbling blocks in Gleneagles.

As the summit approached, pressure for the G8 leaders to produce outcomes also mounted from outside the summit. Leaders of 53 of the African Union countries sent a message to the G8 from their own summit in Sirte, Libya requesting that “developed countries and development partners

²⁵ The Observer. “Geldof delighted at G8 action on aid”. July 10, 2005.

²⁶ BBC. “Summit will expose G8 fault lines”. July 4, 2005.

²⁷ Reuters. “Protesters prepare to march on G8”. July 6, 2005.

²⁸ China Daily. “Developing nations’ role at G8”. July 5, 2005; Christian Science Monitor. “The G8’s bottom line on helping poor nations”. July 7, 2005.

²⁹ China Daily. “Developing nations’ role at G8”. July 5, 2005.

expedite the process of total debt cancellation for Africa by the year 2007”.³⁰ This echoed the calls to “Make Poverty History” (total debt cancellation for all countries, increased and improved foreign aid, and more equitable trade) from countless civil society organisations and the hundreds of thousands of demonstrators gathered in the streets of Edinburgh on July 2, 2005.³¹

Meanwhile, the G8 ‘sherpas’, the official representatives responsible for hammering out the details of agreements in advance of the summit, met in London on July 2. For many, this ‘last-minute meeting’ signalled that the Gleneagles summit may just provide the opportunity for real discussion, instead of the more typical ‘photo opportunity’ summits where leaders only meet to sign pre-agreed communiqués. As the summit drew nearer, there were cautiously optimistic musings that, if agreements had not yet been reached, the door may still be open to demands from the activists. Some believed that this may indeed be the G8 summit to “Make Poverty History”.³²

However, just hours before the summit began, there were signs that the G8 would not fulfil its ambitious agenda. Britain’s Treasury Chief warned that those who believe human misery can be eliminated “with the stroke of a pen” may be disappointed and Britain’s International Development Secretary Hilary Benn cautioned, “People are being ambitious. We are putting pressures on ourselves and on each other. Of course you run the risk [of disappointment], but the greatest crime of all would be not to try in the first place.”³³ And, with the Make Poverty History campaign gearing up for a series of concerts, marches, and events around the world, some officials feared that the huge expectations set by those like Live 8 organiser Bob Geldof would become an “ambush”, condemning leaders as “failure” if the summit failed to provide the desired outcomes.³⁴

UK Chancellor of the Exchequer Gordon Brown echoed the warnings that the G8 was unlikely to meet the campaigners’ expectations: “I know that...you will tell us we’ve got to do more. I know that what you will say is that what we can achieve is perhaps not good enough. But we have got to bring the whole of the world together. What Britain says is one thing; what we can persuade the rest of the world to do together is what we will get as the outcome of Gleneagles”³⁵

Once the summit got underway, it was further complicated by a series of terrorist bombings in London on July 7th, the second day of the summit and the first day of real discussions. Blair temporarily left the summit to be in London, but later returned to Gleneagles to continue the G8 summit. The G8 leaders, though obviously shaken by the events, vowed to continue their discussions. The G8 leaders, together with China, India, and the African states, issued a joint

³⁰ BBC. “Protesters in court ahead of G8”. July 5, 2005; Reuters AlertNet; “Debt relief no panacea for Africa—Nobel laureate”. July 5, 2005; Reuters. “Africa prepares G8 message on aid, debt”. July 5, 2005.

³¹ Reuters. “Protesters prepare to march on G8”. July 6, 2005.

³² Oxfam. “Andrew’s angle”. July 2, 2005.

³³ Reuters. “Africa prepares G8 message on aid, debt”. July 5, 2005; The Age. “Thousands march as G8 leaders dine”. July 6, 2005.

³⁴ BBC. “Summit will expose G8 fault lines”. July 4, 2005.

³⁵ Mail & Guardian Zambia. “G8: Don’t get your hopes up”. July 5, 2005.

statement condemning the attack as “particularly barbaric” given that the leaders were meeting to tackle poverty.³⁶

Meanwhile NGOs and civil society organisations feared that the terrorist attacks that took place on Thursday morning would overshadow Thursday’s much-anticipated discussions on climate change and Friday’s focus on Africa and the final communiqué.

The Gleneagles Agenda

As the chair of this year’s G8 summit, Blair was responsible for deciding upon the priorities for the discussion. As mentioned earlier, Blair selected Africa and climate change, two issues as complex as they are controversial.³⁷

Africa

As part of the 2005 focus on Africa, Blair launched the Commission for Africa to look at the international community’s role in Africa’s development and to produce clear recommendations for the G8 as well as African countries. The 460-page report, entitled “Our Common Interest: Report of the Commission for Africa”, outlines the most pressing challenges facing Africa and puts forth possible solutions.³⁸ The report called for a \$25 billion annual increase in aid to Africa from now until 2010, a doubling of aid donations to reach \$100 billion per year through donations from the European Union, a renewed commitment to meet the 0.7 percent of national income foreign aid target set in the 1970s, and the creation of an International Finance Facility (IFF), a mechanism which would double public aid for development to 100 billion per year by 2015.³⁹

Blair’s apparent personal commitment to the issue of aid for Africa could also be seen in his pre-summit comments, “Africa is the only continent in the world that’s gone backwards in the last 50 years...I find it morally disgusting that thousands of people die every year from killer diseases we can do something about.”⁴⁰

The aid increases suggested in the report, however, were met with some resistance. While the US, the EU, Canada, and Japan all seemed set to double their aid budgets for Africa within this timeline, and after some deliberation, Germany also committed to a similar pledge, Bush rejected the idea of the IFF and warned that developing countries would have to bear some of the burden themselves and be responsible for improving their own situation.⁴¹ Canada, meanwhile, appeared initially reluctant to agree to increasing aid to 0.7% of national income by 2015. Martin said it would be irresponsible as it is “unaffordable”: “We will ultimately [reach] the 0.7 but we’re not going to do it...until we can basically say to Canadians: ‘Here’s how we’re doing it, here’s when we’re going to do it and there’s no caveats, no conditions, we’re just doing it.’”⁴²

³⁶ BBC. “G8 leaders condemn London blasts”. July 7, 2005.

³⁷ The Economist. “The G8’s Africa Challenge.” July 7, 2005.

³⁸ People & Planet. “G8 2005: Background Briefing.” No date given.

³⁹ Christian Science Monitor. “The G8’s bottom line on helping poor nations”. July 7, 2005.

⁴⁰ Christian Science Monitor. “The G8’s bottom line on helping poor nations”. July 7, 2005.

⁴¹ Agence France Presse. “Bush to champion Africa aid cause at G8 summit”. July 4, 2005; The Economist. “The G8’s Africa Challenge.” July 7, 2005.

⁴² Canadian Press. “Bono, Geldof and protesters upstage G8 leaders at summit in Scotland”. July 6, 2005.

On the topic of trade, the G8 leaders seemed destined for a continued stalemate. Bush opposed proposals to reduce farm subsidies, stating he would only consider doing so once the EU agreed to abandon its Common Agricultural Policy and although the EU and Japan agreed to cut agricultural subsidies, an agreement is still elusive. As many had feared, trade issues remain bogged down since the collapse of the WTO trade talks in Cancun in 2003, with fading hope that they can be resolved at the WTO Ministerial in Hong Kong later this year.⁴³

Regarding debt, most of the heavy lifting had been done at the Finance Ministers' Meeting in June. The agreement to forgive the debt of 18, mostly African nations, was valued at more than \$40 billion and trumpeted by the G8 as a major success. However, for those countries left out of the deal, countries like Kenya (not deemed 'heavily indebted') and Nigeria (seen as 'too wealthy', despite low standards of living), the deal was seen as inadequate. Pressure appeared to be mounting from African leaders, evident from the Sirte summit, for total debt cancellation for all countries, no strings attached.⁴⁴

Pushing the G8 leaders to further expand their relief to include corruption money, Nigerian President Olusegun Obasanjo argued: "For Africa, it will require not only the debt forgiveness for which we have been vigorously campaigning, but also a massive inflow of finance through repatriation of corruption-tainted funds in foreign banks, the fulfilment of commitments made by our development partners, new funds through investment,...and our collective political will to undertake our own part for our upliftment."⁴⁵ Libyan leader Muammar Gaddafi, however, rejected the appeals of his African colleagues and warned them against relying on Western aid: "Begging will not make the future of Africa. It creates a greater gap between the great ones and the small ones."⁴⁶

Climate Change

On the key issue of climate change, Bush reiterated his total rejection of the Kyoto Protocol before the summit discussions even began. Bush confirmed that he had no intention of supporting a G8 climate deal and rejected all suggestions that the US would consider any agreement that would cut its emissions of greenhouse gases.⁴⁷ In a pre-summit interview, Bush stated frankly, "If you're trying to make me say I support Kyoto, the answer is no". In place, he said he preferred to focus on the development of new technologies and called for a worldwide effort to invest in oil and gas alternatives.⁴⁸ Arguing that Kyoto "didn't work for the United States and it frankly didn't work for the world" because it excluded developing countries, Bush claimed he was now searching for post-Kyoto solutions.⁴⁹

⁴³ BBC. "Protesters in court ahead of G8". July 5, 2005; Christian Science Monitor. "The G8's bottom line on helping poor nations". July 7, 2005; The Scotsman. "Show of unity tops G8's thorny agenda". July 10, 2005.

⁴⁴ The Economist. "The G8's Africa Challenge." July 7, 2005.

⁴⁵ Reuters AlertNet. "Give us support, not sympathy, Africa tells West". July 4, 2005.

⁴⁶ Reuters AlertNet. "Give us support, not sympathy, Africa tells West". July 4, 2005.

⁴⁷ The Independent. "Bush, the obstacle to a deal on global warming." July 5, 2005.

⁴⁸ Agence France Presse. "Final preparations under way for G8 summit, amidst protest", July 5, 2005.

⁴⁹ Reuters. "Bush urges G8 to lead shift from oil and gas". July 7, 2005.

Days before the summit, however, Bush acknowledged at a meeting in Denmark that “the surface of the earth is warmer and that an increase in greenhouse gases caused by humans is contributing to the problem”, the first such acknowledgement.⁵⁰ Although this was cause for optimism among environmental campaigners, Bush later clarified that he would give no special consideration to Blair or his climate change proposals in exchange for his backing of the war in Iraq. Outlining his stance on the issue, Bush stated clearly, “I go to the G8 not really trying to make [Blair] look bad or good....but I go to the G8 with an agenda that I think is best for our country”.⁵¹ This apparent ‘snub’ of Blair was met with criticism from many sides. Malcolm Bruce, representative from the UK International Development Committee, commented: “The American position is unreasonable, and that should have been made clear. We could and should have expected something better”.⁵²

Perhaps in recognition of the apparent impossibility of reaching agreement on climate change, Blair later acknowledged that “there is no way we are going to resolve the historic disagreement on Kyoto...nor is the G8 the place to negotiate a new treaty.”⁵³ Days before the G8 climate discussions began, a report released by the British House of Lords further undermined Blair’s efforts. The report, echoing US concerns that Kyoto excludes developing countries, claims that the Kyoto Protocol would make “little difference” to the pace of global warming and warns that any climate change treaty would damage the UK economy.⁵⁴ Much as the Bush administration, the report also stated that it prefers to focus on alternatives based on carbon-free technologies and carbon taxation.

Other Topics

The G8 leaders also discussed a range of other pertinent topics, including world oil prices, the situation in Iraq, the Middle East peace process, the nuclear situation with Iran and North Korea, and terrorism.

NGO & Civil Society Expectations

Blair promoted this year’s G8 summit as the ‘year for change’, many NGOs and civil society groups were not convinced that the G8 would actually meet their expectations and “Make Poverty History”. As the summit approached, most groups looked on with cautious optimism, fearing that, as in past summits, the G8 would make promises but never keep them. While Bob Geldof warned Gordon Brown that he was “not prepared to be disappointed” and cautioned him against “lowering the bar”, not all groups were as convinced that the G8 would be such a victory for the poor.⁵⁵

The radical Marxist-Leninist group, A World to Win, for example, argued that anything coming out of the summit was not likely to be surprising or revolutionary. To them, the participation of so

⁵⁰ Canadian Press. “Bono, Geldof, and protesters upstage G8 leaders at summit in Scotland”. July 6, 2005.

⁵¹ BBC. “Summit will expose G8 fault lines”. July 4, 2005.

⁵² The Scotsman. “Show of unity tops G8’s thorny agenda”. July 10, 2005.

⁵³ Reuters. “G8 close to climate deal but it could lack detail.” July 7, 2005.

⁵⁴ The Scotsman. “Lords fuel climate change row with blow to Kyoto”. July 6, 2005.

⁵⁵ Inter-Press Service. “What if they agree to disagree?”. July 6, 2005.

many governments and leaders in the Make Poverty History campaign had already eroded any chance of radical change. In an online article, the group stated: “[The governments’ and leaders’] desire to incorporate the movement is made easier by the fact that the demands on debt and trade do not disturb the running of the capitalist economy”.⁵⁶

Perhaps in anticipation of a weak outcome, one group took the initiative of designing their own communiqué to be signed at the Gleneagles summit. The document, entitled the “Alternative G8 Edinburgh Declaration of Common Security” outlined the radical changes many groups wished to see, albeit somewhat over-optimistic. The comprehensive agreement outlined the desired changes on a wide range of topics: multilateralism, militarism, democracy, non-proliferation, disarmament, human rights, free trade, privatisation, liberalisation, and so on. The document was circulated, signed by a number of groups and individuals, and submitted to the G8 leaders in advance of the summit.⁵⁷

Other groups pointed out that it was misleading for the G8 leaders to propose an “ambitious agenda of change” given that they have already had 30 years to alleviate poverty and have “so far done little to reverse the situation”.⁵⁸ In fact, many groups tend to equate the G8 leaders more with the cause of the problems than the solution. As long as the G8 continues to benefit from unfair trade terms at the expense of the poor, create global environmental problems while resisting efforts to resolve them, and lead the charge in wars and conflict around the world, these groups believe the G8 cannot be entrusted with the task of making change.

As Alex Nunns of the publication Red Pepper explained, “[Some people] are expecting the G8 to come up with a solution when the G8 is itself the problem. This is like petitioning Hitler to help the Jews.” Instead of turning to the G8 to solve G8-caused problems, Nunns argued, NGOs and civil society groups should be looking for more radical courses of action.⁵⁹

Other groups saw this year’s ‘anti-poverty’ agenda as an attempt to undermine civil society protests against the G8. When Blair stated, “It would be very odd if people came to protest against this G8, as we’re focusing on poverty in Africa and climate change...I don’t quite know what they’ll be protesting against”, some groups saw this as a ‘dirty move’. For some, this statement served to separate the “good protesters” (read: those supportive of Blair’s initiatives on Africa and climate change) from the “bad protesters” (read: those calling for radical action and/or those more critical of the G8 as the cause of the problems).⁶⁰ When Blair announced that he was prepared to use the new anti-terror laws against the ‘bad’ protesters, many groups felt that their worst fears were being confirmed—the G8 was attempting to co-opt the Make Poverty History agenda and twist it into a meaningless, rhetorical promise rather than real action. Many ‘bad’ protesters also expressed their frustration that pre-summit media coverage was failing to mention why some groups would be protesting against Blair’s agenda or criticise the G8.

⁵⁶ A World to Win listserve. “After Live 8: from pressure to action”. July 5, 2005.

⁵⁷ To view the entire document, please see Appendix A.

⁵⁸ Spinwatch. “Arguments against the G8”. May 31, 2005.

⁵⁹ Inter-Press Service. “As bloggers will see it”. June 28, 2005.

⁶⁰ SpinWatch. “How to spin the G8”. June 9, 2005.

On another front, more radical groups, including some outside of the Make Poverty History campaign, condemned the Blair government for adopting the issues of Africa and climate change, while failing to address the war in Iraq. According to some groups, it was felt that Blair had adopted these two causes in a “blatant bait-and-switch on the war in Iraq”, allowing for little discussion of the war, both officially and during the protests, until the London bombings forced the leaders to refocus their attention on terrorism and Iraq.⁶¹

Africa

Regarding Blair’s Commission for Africa, NGOs and civil society groups gave the report mixed reviews. While some felt it was important the Commission recognised that Africa cannot develop on its own and requires the assistance of the developed world in terms of trade access, aid, debt relief, and investment, others felt the report missed the point entirely. Emma Miller of the European Network on Debt and Development (EURODAD) felt that, like many previous reports on ‘Africa’s problems’, the Commission failed to understand things from an African perspective. She argued, “The African eyes included in this Commission have been very carefully selected to share the same distorting glasses worn by Blair and his G8 cohorts.” Although the report called for debt relief, Miller also claimed that it overlooked the strings attached to the deal (conditionalities), ignored the existing African structures designed for addressing African problems, and failed to deal with the problem of trade access, among other things.⁶²

SchNEWS, the direct action newsletter from Brighton, also criticised the Commissions’ report. SchNEWS argued that, despite the appearance of humanitarian concerns in the report, there was also a heavy reflection of corporate interest. SchNEWS attributes this to the fact that, among the Commissions’ 16 corporate members are major multinational corporations like Anglo American, Shell, De Beers, Rio Tinto, and Diageo. As a result, SchNEWS claims that the report disproportionately emphasises the role of public-private partnerships (PPPs) and calls for for-profit companies to get involved in the building and operating of infrastructure projects like roads, basic services (water, health, electricity) key to Africa’s development.⁶³

Pressure was also on G8 leaders to address the HIV/AIDS situation as part of their deal on Africa. In a petition organised by Physicians for Human Rights, more than 600 doctors’ groups, development groups, celebrities, and medical associations from around the world urged the leaders to increase their funding to address the health worker crisis. In particular, the petition called for more money to strengthen national health care systems strained by neglect and the AIDS epidemic, better pay for training and higher salaries, as well as better human resource management and safe working conditions.⁶⁴

Meanwhile, ActionAid International pushed for the G8 leaders to commit to providing universal free AIDS treatment by 2010. According to Simon Wright, ActionAid UK HIV and AIDS campaign

⁶¹ AlterNet. “Measuring victory”. July 26, 2005.

⁶² Panos London Online. “A divided house”. July 6, 2005.

⁶³ SchNEWS. “G8 Special”. July 1, 2005.

⁶⁴ For further information, please visit: www.phrusa.org

leader, “This year of all years, the G8 must respond to the worldwide movement demanding access to AIDS treatment. If the G8 does not commit to increasing access to treatment, they will be failing to act on the single biggest threat to development that the world faces. The AIDS crisis is the strongest argument for doubling aid, for debt relief, and for fair trade.”⁶⁵

Climate Change

Although climate change was designated as a ‘priority’ of this year’s summit, many NGOs and civil society groups doubted from the beginning that the discussions would end in agreement, let alone action. As Dr. Rajendra K. Pachauri, Chair of the UN Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change stated, “Frankly, I don’t think we should have very high expectations of a single event like this. What would be far more important than anything that happens at the summit is the desire and decision to keep moving and to engage in dialogue on a regular basis, because I think a lot will have to be done after the summit.”⁶⁶

A somewhat more pessimistic view, however, was voiced by a number of NGOs. A representative of Corporate Watch claimed that “the UK and the other G8 countries cannot move against climate change in a serious way, as this would involve challenging their dependence on oil.”⁶⁷ Friends of the Earth International Vice Chair Tony Juniper went further, arguing that the Bush administrations’ policies, in particular, are “short-sighted, negligent, and immoral” and disputed the President’s logic that he could protect the American economy by avoiding an emissions reduction agreement. Rather, Juniper claimed that these actions will “lead to economic dangers of immense scale, including in the USA”, while acknowledging that the cause of US resistance to a climate agreement stems from the fact the Bush agenda is “clearly driven by vested interests, including companies which see America’s addiction to oil as a licence to print money”.⁶⁸

Director of WWF’s Global Climate Change Programme Jennifer Morgan also commented on the “arrogance and selfishness” of Bush’s stance on Kyoto, showing little optimism for a meaningful G8 climate outcome. She questioned how Bush could “look people suffering the devastating impacts of climate change across the world in the eye and use the false argument of wrecking the US economy?” She added that Bush’s preferred alternative to the Kyoto Protocol, the advancement of alternative technologies in place of emissions controls, would be “laughable, if we could still afford a sense of humour”.⁶⁹

To this, British Director of Greenpeace Stephen Tindale added a sense of urgency. Urging G8 leaders to act immediately, Tindale argued: “We have about a decade to sort this problem [of climate change] out. Bush is saying he will do what he can, but there is no firm commitment...It is more than disappointing. It is deeply angering.”⁷⁰ Tindale also added that, although “[the summit] provides an opportunity for leaders to reinforce their commitment to fighting climate change and map out a way ahead, there is a real risk that, in the quest for consensus, President

⁶⁵ ActionAid. “Tighter regulation is needed if business is to clean up its act in Africa”. July 5, 2005.

⁶⁶ Inter-Press Service. “Expect little on climate, says top UN expert”. July 2, 2005.

⁶⁷ Corporate Watch. “The G8 summit: better living through corporate rule?”. June/July 2005.

⁶⁸ Friends of the Earth. “Bush rejects climate deal”. July 4, 2005.

⁶⁹ WWF. “Bush’s selfish response to global climate change”. July 5, 2005.

⁷⁰ Reuters. “Bush urges G8 to lead shift from oil and gas”. July 7, 2005.

Bush will prevail and we will end up with a weak, compromised statement that could set back climate protection by years.” As a result, Tindale and other NGOs called for leadership from the other G8 heads and urged them to insist on a strong, clear message on climate change, even if the result is a ‘split’ communiqué.”⁷¹

Therefore, when the first draft of the climate communiqué was leaked to the press on June 14, 2005, many NGOs and civil society groups feared the worst. In the weeks before the summit, activist and environmental groups expressed their disappointment and frustration with the leaked text, particularly with its lack of targets and timetables for action as well as its questioning stance on the science behind climate. Friends of the Earth condemned the American efforts to water down the wording of the agreement and Guardian journalist/activist George Monbiot complained that, “While the first draft was disastrous, the second was even worse”. Monbiot was astonished that the draft text did not even show agreement that climate change was taking place, likening the situation to peace negotiating when no one admits that a war has taken place.⁷²

Despite their frustration, however, many groups refocused their efforts and outlined new demands to the G8 leaders, challenging them to produce a better text. Friends of the Earth outlined their own four-point plan for combating climate change involving temperature controls, specific agreement and timeline for emissions reductions, new financing mechanisms, and assistance for developing countries.⁷³ George Monbiot called for stiff regulation of business, increased energy efficiency, and decreased energy demands. In a joint document, Greenpeace, WWF, Friends of the Earth, The Royal Society for the Protection of Birds, and Tearfund called for the G8 leaders to make a clear statement that they accept the science behind climate change, send a clear signal to the business community that G8 is committed to a cap and trade emissions trading system and further emissions reductions even after 2012 (post-Kyoto), and firmly commit to assistance for developing countries to adapt to climate change. WWF added its call for the G8 to recognise that the rise in overall global warming must be kept well below 2 degrees Celsius in comparison to pre-industrial levels.⁷⁴

NGOs also began invoking a variety of different discourses in an effort to spur the G8 leaders to action. Andrew Simms of the New Economics Foundation, for instance, employed the concept of “ecological debt”. Arguing that, with only 14 percent of the world’s population, the G8 are responsible for 47 percent of the carbon dioxide emissions but that the effects of climate change hit the poor the hardest, Simms claims the G8 countries are, thus, indebted to the south. “The G8...present themselves as benevolent international creditors. But their disproportionately high use of fossil fuels makes them global ecological debtors, stealing the environmental capital of poor countries to support their own development. They are parasites,” he argued.⁷⁵

⁷¹ Greenpeace. “G8 leaders should ignore Bush, not the climate”. July 6, 2005; Reuters. “G8 close to climate deal but it could lack detail.” July 7, 2005; Green Alliance. “EU Presidency offers more hope for climate change than Gleneagles”. July 1, 2005.

⁷² UK Indymedia. “Climate change is the most important issue on our agenda”. July 6, 2005; Friends of the Earth Scotland. “It’s time for urgent action on climate change”. June 23, 2005.

⁷³ Friends of the Earth Scotland. “It’s time for urgent action on climate change”. June 23, 2005.

⁷⁴ WWF. “What does the WWF want from G8?” No date given.

⁷⁵ People & Planet. “G8 2005: Background Briefing.” No date given.

WWF, on the other hand, resorted to the use of “G8 Climate Scorecards”. The system, which marks the G8 countries based on 10 criteria aims to provide a snapshot of recent and expected emissions. WWF claims that the scorecards show that US is the “schoolroom dunce” on the issue, but also that “none of the other top eight students look particularly bright either”, thus hoping to shame the leaders into action. The cards suggest that, if US continues to be the “weakest link”, perhaps it is time for it to be “left behind”.⁷⁶

The Royal Society for the Protection of Birds appealed to the G8 to act on climate change for the sake of Africa. In a press release, the RSPB argued: “...Failing to act on climate change will undermine any progress on the other main item at the summit: Africa. Climate change will bring ever more misery to most Africans. As Archbishop Desmond Tutu said, ‘It is important to understand that Africa and climate change are intrinsically linked, as climate change will affect the welfare of Africans for years to come. Africans look forward to seeing some firm outcomes from these commitments during Blair’s presidency of the G8 and the European Union. Words will not be enough.’”⁷⁷

Some NGOs also turned to Americans for support for a better text on climate change. As Friends of the Earth pointed out, support for action on climate change is growing even among Republican senators in the US. As an Inter-Press opinion poll indicates, 94 percent of Americans believe that Washington should do at least as much, if not more, than other industrialised nations in limiting greenhouse emissions and three in four Americans believe that the US should sign on to Kyoto.⁷⁸ Therefore, FOE urged Americans to push their President to do better.⁷⁹

National science academies also joined forces, hoping that their intellectual appeals would influence the G8 leaders. The academies of the G8 countries, together with China, Brazil, and India called on the leaders to prevent further warming by substantially reducing emissions. Appeals for action also emanated from the business community. Leaders of some major multinational corporations, such as BP, Ford, British Airways, Rio Tinto, and Toyota, called for a worldwide carbon trading system that would define emissions rights and set limits on how much carbon dioxide businesses could produce in order to create a level playing field for corporations operating in different countries.⁸⁰

Despite their energetic campaigns for improvements to the climate change text, however, many groups were already resigned to the reality that little would come out of Gleneagles. While not giving up entirely on Gleneagles, many groups were already shifting their focus to other upcoming events. As Guy Thompson of the Green Alliance, an EU-wide federation of 143 environment groups explained, “At the end of the day, the G8 is a talking shop. There is absolutely no chance of getting a decent deal on climate change at Gleneagles. The prospects of re-galvanising talks

⁷⁶ WWF. “You are the weakest link, WWF tells Bush administration”. July 4, 2005.

⁷⁷ Royal Society for the Protection of Birds. “G8, climate change, and why the RSPB cares.” July 4, 2005.

⁷⁸ Inter-Press Service. “Bush increasingly isolated on warming”. July 5, 2005.

⁷⁹ Friends of the Earth. “Bush rejects climate deal”. July 4, 2005.

⁸⁰ Financial Times. “Market rides to the rescue of environment”. July 6, 2005.

on post-Kyoto are far greater under the UK's Presidency of the EU, which begins today." Thompson also said that he hoped that Blair would push for two objectives during the EU presidency—the opening up of negotiations with emerging economies, particularly China and India, with hope of building cooperation and understanding; and, second, establishing the conditions for the second stage of the EU's own climate change programme, based on emissions trading and reductions.⁸¹

With further UN negotiations on the Framework Convention on Climate Change to be held at the end of this year in Montreal, many seemed prepared to avoid a weak G8 agreement that included the US and set their sights on the upcoming negotiations instead.⁸²

Aid, Trade, and Debt Relief

For many NGOs and civil society groups, their expectations of the G8 on aid, trade, and debt relief were spelled out in the Make Poverty History campaign declaration. The detailed document states that, although the groups believed that trade can be a powerful engine for poverty reduction, G8 leaders would need to end "rigged trade rules and double standards that damage poor people's livelihoods". The document also states that the debt crisis is "still far from over" as many countries are still spending more on debt repayments than on meeting the needs of their people. Therefore, the groups called for full and unconditional debt cancellation. On aid, the groups emphasised that the amount of aid and how it is spent is critical in poverty reduction. Members called on the G8 to deliver the \$50 billion per year promised by wealthy countries immediately and keep their commitment of spending 0.7 percent of their national income on overseas aid.⁸³

Sensing that the US government might be reluctant to increase its aid any further, let alone allow for debt cancellation, many American NGOs focused their efforts on convincing Bush of the need for change. InterAction, an alliance of 160 American NGOs called for "a greater US commitment to Africa" and said it would hold the administration accountable for the promises it has made. InterAction President Mohammed Akhter argued, "The G8 summit is only the beginning of this fight". Oxfam America's Director of Policy Chad Dobson called for the US to take a leading role at the G8, given that "Americans are a generous people and care about these issues". Additionally, more than 10 000 members of the Jubilee USA Network sent messages urging Bush to cancel the debt and refrain from tying any increases in aid to the purchase of US goods and services.⁸⁴

Meanwhile, the Catholic Agency for Overseas Development targeted its own UK government. The organisation called for the UK government to "fight for rules that ensure governments can choose the best solution to end poverty and protect the environment" and argued that this would not always be the free trade solution the UK government seeks. In addition to total debt cancellation and increased foreign aid, CAFOD also called upon the UK to abandon its export subsidies as they

⁸¹ Green Alliance. "EU Presidency offers more hope for climate change than Gleneagles". July 1, 2005.

⁸² Green Alliance. "EU Presidency offers more hope for climate change than Gleneagles". July 1, 2005; Inter-Press Service. "Expect little on climate, says top UN expert". July 2, 2005.

⁸³ For further details, please see Appendix B.

⁸⁴ Inter-Press Service. "US groups prod Bush over poverty and Africa". July 5, 2005.

damage the livelihoods of poor rural communities around the world and to stop making ‘business-friendly’ laws at the expense of environments and people.⁸⁵

CAFOD Head of Policy George Gelber also added that the expectations of increased aid and debt relief were not unreasonable. “In a world that spends one trillion dollars a year on arms and armies, it is inconceivable that the richest countries cannot find the extra \$50 billion a year—a twentieth of this sum—to help put an end to the cycle of poverty and despair across the developing world...But it’s not only money we are asking for—we are demanding a dramatic change to rules that deny developing countries the change to earn their own way in the world.”⁸⁶

Echoing these concerns, Friends of the Earth called for the UK to radically change its approach to dealing with developing countries. Duncan McLaren, a FOE representative, explained: “When the UK hosts the G8 summit in Gleneagles, the right issues will be on the table, but the wrong solutions. The UK and the rest of the G8 are all too ready to impose market liberalisation and privatisation on developing countries, even when those policies will seriously worsen the complex problems of climate change, poverty, and inequality. Delivering sustainable development and saving the world’s climate will take new radical approaches, not more of the same failed recipe from the G8”.⁸⁷

In a joint statement, World Development Movement and Friends of the Earth outlined their opposition to specific UK policies including: the UK’s “aggressive free trade negotiations at the WTO; bilateral trade agreements that “expose small producers to unfair competition”; the privatisation of services in developing countries; climate change and failed emissions reductions strategies; and corporate accountability based on voluntary self-regulation.⁸⁸

Tackling the issue from another perspective, Consumers International called for the G8 leaders to take consumers into consideration at the summit. In a pre-summit report, entitled ‘The G8 and Africa: Turn Talk into Action’, the organisation urged the G8 to reform international trade laws in order to open up markets to African products while still granting a measure of protection to African farmers. The report appealed to the G8 leaders to provide global consumers with quality goods at affordable prices.⁸⁹

Consumers International G8 spokesperson Amadou Kanoute also pushed leaders to use the summit as a “crucial opportunity for the leaders of the richest countries to make a real difference in the lives of 350 millions African consumers who live on less than \$1 per day.” Kanoute encouraged leaders to move past debt relief. As he explained, “Dropping the debt is only the beginning. The rich countries must allow free and fair trade—otherwise African economies will not prosper.”⁹⁰

⁸⁵ Catholic Agency for Overseas Development. “Make Poverty History”. January 2005.

⁸⁶ CAFOD. “No more broken promises—seize the moment”. July 6, 2005.

⁸⁷ Friends of the Earth Scotland. “G8 in Scotland will discuss ‘right issues, but wrong solutions’”. No date given.

⁸⁸ Friends of the Earth Scotland. “G8 in Scotland will discuss ‘right issues, but wrong solutions’”. No date given.

⁸⁹ Consumers International. www.consumersinternational.org

⁹⁰ Consumers International. “World consumers body joins massive rally to Make Poverty History”. June 30, 2005.

Yassine Fall, President of the African Women's Millennium Initiative on Poverty and Human Rights also called on G8 leaders to reform international trade. Arguing that aid would be of little use as "G8 leaders pressure Africa to open more markets to privatised services like health and education", she appealed for greater trade access for African producers instead.⁹¹ Pointing out that over the last 40 years, Africa has been given more than 500 billion in aid, but continues to remain poor because roughly 60 to 70 percent of it "goes back to donor countries to pay for consultants and for products they insist be bought from their countries", Fall urged the G8 to improve trade access as a better solution.

As with climate change, however, many groups remained only cautiously optimistic that their expectations would be fulfilled. As Nancy Birdsall from the Centre for Global Development explained, too many past pledges and G8 promises have not been kept. Pointing to the promise of funding for poor nations made more than four years ago that has still not materialised, Birdsall, like many others, is trying to keep the rhetoric in perspective.⁹²

Water and Sanitation

As part of their campaign for increased G8 spending, specifically on water and sanitation for the world's poor, WaterAid delivered over 18 000 "toilet roll" messages to Tony Blair. Sally Warren, the Campaigns Coordinator, explained: "Enough is enough. We want trade justice, debt cancellation, and more and better aid for the world's poorest people". Calling for immediate action, she added, "During the three days of the G8 summit, over 17 000 children will die from preventable diseases caused by dirty water and poor sanitation. July 2, 2005, will be remembered as the day the world cried out for justice. I hope that the G8 will grasp the opportunity to make a difference to the lives of billions of people living in poverty and put an end to this scandalous situation."⁹³

ALTERNATIVE EVENTS

A number of alternative G8 events were held earlier this year in preparation for the G8 summit in Gleneagles. Beginning with the launch of the Global Call to Action against Poverty (GCAP) in January 2005 at the World Social Forum in Porto Alegre, Brazil, planning has since been underway for a number of alternative G8 events.⁹⁴ G8-related events also took place during the Global Week of Action on Trade, held in April 2005 and the Education Action Week, held that same month.⁹⁵ Countless other planning and strategy sessions and conferences took place in the weeks leading up to the Gleneagles summit, including:

⁹¹ Inter-Press Service. "Poverty campaign throws a final challenge". July 6, 2005.

⁹² Inter-Press Service. "US groups prod Bush over poverty and Africa". July 5, 2005.

⁹³ WaterAid website. "WaterAid helps to Make Poverty History at the G8". July 18, 2005.

⁹⁴ For further information, please visit: www.whiteband.org

⁹⁵ For further information, please visit: www.april2005.org or www.ei-ie.org/globalactionweek

G8 Climate Counter-Summit: “Moving beyond the Greenwash”

Held March 14 in London, the event was hosted by the G8 Climate Action Group, Rising Tide, Carbon Trade Watch, Platform, TRAPESE, Friends of the Earth, and Greenpeace.⁹⁶

Anti-G8 Summit / 4th Forum of the Peoples

Held in Fana, Mali in advance of the G8 summit, the event was designed to remind the world's leading industrialised nations of “what is at stake in their negotiations to end poverty in Africa”. The 4-day meeting, which doubled as the fourth ‘Forum of the Peoples’, focused on the world's poorest countries and their own solutions to their problems and involved workshops on debt, the dangers of genetically-modified organisms (GMOs), and progress to date on the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). Organisers of the forum expected it would attract roughly 2 000 people, as many local cotton-producers are affected by unfair trade subsidies.⁹⁷

Pre-G8 Summit

Held in Stirling, Scotland, on May 22, 2005, the Pre-G8 summit was geared toward planning events for the July summit. Organised by Wimmin vs. the G8, the Pre-Summit hosted a variety of “anti-capitalist shenanigans” with a medieval twist. Organisers promoted “protest in the ‘olde style’”, including knights in distress, damsels in shining armour, witches, druids, jesters, jousters, and so on, and suggested that participants “BYO battering ram”.⁹⁸

The Model G8 Summit for Youth

The Model G8 Summit for Youth was held in Edinburgh, Scotland on July 1, 2005 and was hosted by the Trade Union Congress (TUC). Participants, aged 18 to 30, discussed a range of issues, including trade, debt, aid, and how these affect working people around the world and produced a final communiqué to send to the G8 leaders. Commenting on the importance of the event, TUC General Secretary Brendan Barber said: “Young people are not naïve about the difficult decisions facing world leaders at the G8 summit. But they are passionate about the urgent need to drop world debt, increase and improve aid, and build a fairer trade system. Hopefully as well as learning more about the issues world leaders will be grappling with next week, young trade unionists can set an example of how the real summit could make poverty history”.⁹⁹

Make Poverty History Campaign and March

The Make Poverty History (MPH) march took place on July 2, 2005 in Edinburgh, Scotland. Between 250 000 and 400 000 people joined the march, many wearing white bands to demonstrate their solidarity with Africa and the Make Poverty History campaign goals.

Among the marchers were politicians, anti-poverty campaigners, parents and children, and, according to march organisers, many first time protesters. As the march wound through the streets of old Edinburgh and past the MPH banners draped on Princes Street and from Edinburgh

⁹⁶ For further information, please visit: www.risingtide.org.uk

⁹⁷ Mail & Guardian Zambia. “G8: Don’t get your hopes up”. July 5, 2005.

⁹⁸ For further information, please visit: <http://g8feministaction.frockon.org/events.html>

⁹⁹ Trades Union Congress website. “Young people’s G8 summit shows world leaders how to end poverty”. June 30, 2005.

Castle, the group chanted: “Murder, war, poverty, hate! We say shut down G8!” From within the crowds, actor Pete Postlethwaite warned the G8 leaders of the need for urgent action. “We have had enough political spin, promises, and downright lies”, he said.¹⁰⁰

Although protest organisers had planned the march to be led by a group of Cardinals, the Moderator of the Church of Scotland, charity leaders, and musicians, a group of 30 placard-waving protesters from the Manchester-based art group ‘Nato’ overtook them. Waving sarcastic signs such as “Profits before people”, “G8 is Great”, “4X4s are Cool”, “Bomb Iran”, “Capitalism Rocks”, “Bring Back the Slave Trade”, and “Greed Works”, the group initially confused some marchers and many onlookers.¹⁰¹

At 3 pm, the march observed a minute of silence in remembrance of those living in extreme poverty around the world. Later that afternoon, a group of some 200 000 people formed a human chain in the likeness of a white wristband, the symbol of the MPH campaign, to show their solidarity with Africa.¹⁰²

Although the war in Iraq was not supposed to be a focus of the march, some drew attention to it regardless. Dawn, the mother of a 12 year old protester, explained her reason for marching: “We are marching to show our commitment against war and poverty. We want them to spend the money they shell out on killing people on saving people instead.”¹⁰³ Additionally, Walden Bello from Focus on the Global South, spoke out against the war. “Can we really feel the pain of our brothers and sisters in Africa suffering poverty without at the same time feeling the pain of our brothers and sisters in Iraq suffering from a horrible foreign occupation?...So let us tell Mr. Bush, Mr. Blair, Mr. Berlusconi, and Mr. Koizumi: We will not allow you to use the rhetoric of fighting poverty in Africa to deflect our attention from your criminal occupation and violations of human rights in Iraq.”¹⁰⁴

Other speakers at the event included several Roman Catholic cardinals, the Moderator of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, human rights activist Bianca Jagger, pop star Daniel Bedingfield, CIVICUS and GCAP Head Kumi Naidoo, and many others. A message from Pope Benedict was also read out to the crowd in which he called for people from the world’s richest countries to accept the burden of debt reduction for poor countries.¹⁰⁵

In anticipation of the march, security in the city of Edinburgh was tightened. A ring of steel was erected around the Scottish Parliament and Holyrood House, the Queen’s palace, and Her Majesty’s annual summer vacation to the city was re-scheduled. Despite initial concerns about large numbers of marchers creating chaos, however, many observers later commented that the event was remarkable well-organised with few problems.

¹⁰⁰ The Guardian. “Prayers for the dead and destitute at Edinburgh’s carnival of hope”. July 3, 2005.

¹⁰¹ The Guardian. “First steps in world’s ‘moral crusade’”. July 4, 2005.

¹⁰² The Guardian. “200 000 form Edinburgh human chain”. July 2, 2005.

¹⁰³ Edinburgh Evening News. “Day of Destiny”. July 2, 2005.

¹⁰⁴ Focus on the Global South. “Making the G8 history”. July 6, 2005.

¹⁰⁵ The Guardian. “Prayers for the dead and destitute at Edinburgh’s carnival of hope”. July 3, 2005.

Many credited the organisers with sending a very powerful message to the G8 leaders. Addressing a Christian Aid rally held earlier, UK Chancellor Gordon Brown claimed that the MPH campaign had achieved more in the last months than “politicians working alone could have achieved in 100 years.”¹⁰⁶ And, after chairing a meeting of international parliamentarians on the topics of debt, aid, and trade, Scotland’s First Minister Jack McConnell commented that the MPH rally, the biggest ever public demonstration to take place in Scotland, represented a “fantastic carnival atmosphere and a message of hope”.¹⁰⁷ Echoing these sentiments, MPH spokesperson Richard-Saville claimed it was a “really friendly, carnival atmosphere, which we always said it would be... and a fun day out for the family with a very serious message.”¹⁰⁸

The Make Poverty History march was also recognized for successfully engaging youth. Emily Eavis, 25, commented: “There is a real sea change among young people...Ten years ago, when I first became aware of politics and music, the two never seemed to mix very well. People thought they couldn’t make a difference. Now there’s a real sense that young people can change things.”

ActionAid representatives also claimed that the youth participation in the G8 march represented a “seismic shift” in youth engagement. ActionAid spokesperson Taahra Ghazi noted, “Our experience is that they are not politically apathetic and they are very engaged. They do care and they hate injustice”. Some, however, were worried that this upswing in youth involvement may be only part of a trend, and that the white wristbands, along with the interest in issues, could quickly fall out of fashion.¹⁰⁹

The white wristbands, however, also came under intense fire for a different reason. Several weeks before the G8 summit began, it was discovered that many of the wristbands were produced at Chinese forced-labour firm, Tat Shing.¹¹⁰ The public relations disaster took another turn for the worse when it was also discovered that special edition charity wristbands with the logos of six global fashion brands (Henry Lloyd, Firetrap, Diesel, G-star, Reply, and Tommy Hilfiger) were sold. Given that none of the six brands are listed as members of the UK Ethical Trading Initiative, and Hilfiger Denim, whose owner, Tommy Hilfiger Corporation, is accused of sweatshop labour and anti-unionism by labour rights campaigners, many MPH members were extremely upset. Some groups like War on Want that take a tough stance on these issues and strive to distance themselves from such practices, were furious.¹¹¹

Naomi Klein’s criticism of the wristbands was that the giant white ‘bracelet’ represented “a little too effectively” that the MPH campaign was merely an “accessory” to the G8, pointing to the participation in the campaign of many government officials and G8 ‘insiders’. In place of simply

¹⁰⁶ The Guardian. “200 000 form Edinburgh human chain”. July 2, 2005.

¹⁰⁷ Edinburgh Evening News. “Day of Destiny”. July 2, 2005; The Guardian. “200 000 form Edinburgh human chain”. July 2, 2005.

¹⁰⁸ Edinburgh Evening News. “Day of Destiny”. July 2, 2005; BBC. “Thousands flock to poverty march.” July 2, 2005.

¹⁰⁹ The Guardian. “A new generation learns the power of protest”. July 2, 2005.

¹¹⁰ UK Indymedia. “African activists: Make Poverty History is being co-opted”. July 8, 2005; Red Pepper. “Average, white band”. July 2005.

¹¹¹ SpinWatch. “Make Poverty History in turmoil over new wristband scandal”. June 10, 2005; Focus on the Global South. “MPH: a sanitized campaign?” June 27, 2005.

wearing the wristbands, therefore, she called for activists to “encircle the G8”, and “instead of declaring themselves a piece of jewellery, they should say, we are a noose, we are putting pressure and we are squeezing these neo-liberal policies that are taking lives around the world, just like the noose that killed Ken Saro-Wiwa 10 years ago this November.”¹¹²

There was also criticism of the MPH campaign from within its ranks. Some groups complained that the “real demands on trade, aid, and debt, and criticisms of UK government policy in developing countries have been consistently swallowed up by white bands, celebrity luvvies and praise upon praise for Blair and Brown being ahead of other world leaders on these issues.”¹¹³ Other groups accused Oxfam, one of the leading members of the MPH campaign, of being “too cosy” with the UK government. Given Oxfam receives some of its funding from the UK government, certain groups felt this weakened their ability to be “effectively critical”.¹¹⁴

Guardian journalist/activist George Monbiot was also critical of the influence of politicians over the MPH campaign. In an article critical of the inclusion of politicians like UK Secretary of State for International Development Hilary Benn, Monbiot wrote that he wondered, “What would he be chanting? ‘Down with me and all I stand for?’” Claiming that Benn is the “man in charge of using British aid to persuade African countries to privatise public services” and the MPH was supposedly a protest against such policies..., Monbiot felt that this weakened the entire message of the campaign to the point of mere rhetoric. As a result, he argued, “nothing either Live 8 or MPH has done so far represents a threat to power”.

Monbiot also argued that, with parties, protesters and political and business leaders sharing each others stages, this “new consensus...denies that there’s a conflict between ending poverty and business as usual” and fails to identify the fact that “Africa’s new best friends” are in fact, its historical enemies.¹¹⁵ Despite the apparent contradiction, Monbiot claims that this allows the G8 leaders and business interests to “absorb the MPH demands for aid, debt, even slightly fairer terms of trade, and lose nothing...They can even wear our colours, speak our language, claim to support our aims, and discover in our agitation, not new constraints, but new opportunities for manufacturing consent. Justice, this consensus says, can be achieved without confronting power”.¹¹⁶

For Indymedia authors/activists Patrick Bond, Dennis Brutus, and Virginia Setshedi, the tight relationship between Oxfam and the UK government has “neutered the demands, strategies, and tactics of the 450-member NGO campaign”.¹¹⁷ Other organisations complained that, despite their demands appearing fairly radical on paper, the UK government proved too adept at co-

¹¹² Red Pepper. “Average, white band”. July 2005.

¹¹³ Focus on the Global South. “MPH: a sanitized campaign?” June 27, 2005.

¹¹⁴ Focus on the Global South. “MPH: a sanitized campaign?” June 27, 2005.

¹¹⁵ The Guardian. “Africa’s new best friends”. July 5, 2005.

¹¹⁶ The Guardian. “Hello, old friends”. July 6, 2005.

¹¹⁷ UK Indymedia. “African activists: Make Poverty History is being co-opted”. July 8, 2005; Red Pepper. “Average, white band”. July 2005.

opting the terms, thus making their own proposals “virtually indistinguishable” from those of the MPH campaign.¹¹⁸

Similarly, Peter Hardstaff, Head of Policy at World Development Movement, accused the UK government of trying to “hijack the MPH agenda for political gain” and for “using spin to hide the difference between UK policy and campaigners demands”. According to Hardstaff, in their efforts to “wrap themselves in the white band of the MPH coalition”, politicians like Benn and Brown use “constant repetition that it is all about debt cancellation, trade justice, and more aid” in an attempt to “gloss over the very real policy differences and hoodwink the public into thinking they are fully signed up to our agenda”. The reality, Hardstaff claimed, is that “despite a few recent welcome concessions, there is still a massive gap between the demands of MPH and the UK government”.¹¹⁹

To express their frustration with the co-optation of the MPH campaign by governments, three World Development Movement activists climbed a 150-foot crane outside of Edinburgh’s Waverly Station on July 5, and hung a banner denouncing “Brown-washing”. Leila Deen, one of the climbers, stated: “We feel it our obligation, on behalf of the thousands of people who marched on Saturday, to decry the trick this government is trying to pull. The crumbs of debt relief and aid increases that will be announced on Friday remain tied to debilitating conditions, which stand in direct contradiction of MPH.”¹²⁰

In the eyes of other critics, the weakness of the MPH campaign was that it missed the main point and/or failed to push hard enough for radical change. Some argued that, with a few exceptions like World Development Movement, War on Want, and Christian Aid, many MPH members were content with calling for moderate action from the G8 leaders. In an article in Red Pepper, the MPH was blasted for using “semantic wiggling” when asking for “cancellation of poor countries’ unpayable debts”, a demand criticised both for its vagueness as well as for its use of weak, “weasel words” like ‘unpayable’.¹²¹

Like many MPH critics, Nobel laureate Wangari Maathai claimed that writing off Africa’s debt, boosting aid, and improving trade are simply not enough to bring the continent out of poverty. In her opinion, the campaign could also have focused more on the need for good governance, an end to corruption, and education beyond mere basic schooling. “Cancelling the debt is not the panacea”, she stated, but part of the problem is that “there are a lot of people who think it would be because we keep saying ‘debt, debt, debt’”.¹²²

For Nicola Bullard, Focus on the Global South, the entire platform of the campaign was insufficient. In an article, Bullard wrote that she hoped no one was “under the illusion that the G8

¹¹⁸ Focus on the Global South. “MPH: a sanitized campaign?” June 27, 2005.

¹¹⁹ World Development Movement. “UK has hijacked Make Poverty History rhetoric but not the policies says WDM”. July 5, 2005.

¹²⁰ World Development Movement. “UK has hijacked Make Poverty History rhetoric but not the policies says WDM”. July 5, 2005; World Development Movement. “WDM Brighton crane activists arrested”. July 5, 2005.

¹²¹ Red Pepper. “Average, white band”. July 2005.

¹²² Reuters AlertNet. “Debt relief no panacea for Africa—Nobel laureate”. July 5, 2005.

has any intention of ‘making poverty history’” and stated that she wished the MPH had, instead of embracing the G8s proposal as a ‘welcome and significant first step’, rather told Gordon Brown and the G8 that ‘this was simply not good enough’, and threatened to blockade the summit unless they offered more.”¹²³

Gerald Caplan, an Africa-based UN worker, criticised the campaign for relying on the G8 for anything, particularly for attempting to undo the damage that many claim it has caused. “Anyone who doesn’t distrust the G8 leaders...hasn’t been paying attention. Those people lead countries responsible for the economic apartheid that characterises rich-poor country relations today. Every one of them has failed to live up to repeated pledges about aid, debt relief and agricultural subsidies, solemnly made and blithely ignored...The G8 should not be the object of our supplication. It should be the object of our protest and resistance.”¹²⁴

The MPH was also criticised for undermining the work being done by many social movements. By using the “already watered down MDGs” (now commonly referred to as the Minimalist Development Goals) as the basis for the MPH campaign, movements calling for radical change such as Via Campesina, International Peoples Health Council, Global Campaign for Education, People’s World Water Forum, Durban Declaration on Climate Change, Jubilee South, and Our World is Not for Sale network felt marginalised by their demands for real change, particularly by the ‘large’, ‘mainstream’ NGOs, like Oxfam.¹²⁵

Many of the anti-war groups were similarly angry at MPH members’ refusals to include an anti-war message in their campaign. Groups known for protesting the war, such as Dissent!, Trident Ploughshares, and G8 Alternatives, claimed that MPH actively sought to marginalise them and their message by vetoing Stop the War Coalitions’ application to join the MPH twice and banning the Coalition from having a stall at the MPH rally. The unanimous decision to ban the anti-war protesters was taken by the MPH Coordinating Team, including representatives from Oxfam, Comic Relief and the Trade Unions Congress.¹²⁶ According to a Red Pepper article, this falls in line with the MPH agreement with the UK government to tone down any anti-war message that would embarrass Brown and Blair.¹²⁷

Despite efforts to avoid the issue of war, however, many speakers touched on the topic and some NGOs called upon protesters not to wear just white in solidarity with MPH, but to reflect a diversity of issues. Nicola Bullard, Focus on the Global South, urged protesters to wear red for those civilians killed in Iraq, green for the failure of the G8 to address global warming, black for Carlo Giuliani killed at the G8 in Genoa, and all other colours of resistance.¹²⁸

¹²³ Focus on the Global South listserve. “A message to everyone going to Edinburgh on July 2”. June 27, 2005.

¹²⁴ Focus on the Global South listserve. “A message to everyone going to Edinburgh on July 2”. June 27, 2005.

¹²⁵ Red Pepper. “Average, white band”. July 2005.

¹²⁶ Focus on the Global South. “MPH: a sanitized campaign?” June 27, 2005.

¹²⁷ UK Indymedia. “African activists: Make Poverty History is being co-opted”. July 8, 2005; Red Pepper. “Average, white band”. July 2005.

¹²⁸ Focus on the Global South listserve. “A message to everyone going to Edinburgh on July 2”. June 27, 2005.

Like the anti-war groups and social movements, some African NGOs claimed that their message was being silenced and their movements were being marginalised too. Kofi Maluwi Klu, a Ghanaian activist complained: “We have a saying in the African liberation movement—‘nothing about us, without us’. The MPH is a massive step backwards in this regard, even from Jubilee 2000. The campaign is overwhelmingly led by Northern NGOs and its basic message is about white millionaire pop-stars saving Africa’s helpless. The political movements still fighting for liberation on the ground are completely erased”.¹²⁹

The Live 8 Concerts

Held in ten cities across the world on July 2, 2005, and in Edinburgh on July 6, 2005, the Live 8 concerts, like the Make Poverty History campaign, called for the G8 leaders to double aid, fully cancel debt, and deliver trade justice for Africa. By raising the consciousness of the general public, Live 8 organisers sought to increase the pressure on G8 leaders from within their own countries.¹³⁰ However, unlike Live Aid, the event’s twenty-year old predecessor, the Live 8 concerts were part of the Long Walk to Justice, an effort to bring ordinary people together into action using their voices, rather than their wallets; hence the slogan, “We do not want your money, we want you”.¹³¹

According to organisers, the event was borne out of the frustration of 20 years of little change on the same problems, with political leaders making and breaking the same promises year after year.¹³² As a result, several individuals, including British scriptwriter Richard Curtis, U2 lead man Bono, Live Aid organiser and singer Bob Geldof, and musician Midge Ure, with the support of several corporations, including AOL, BBC, Nokia, Capital Radio, and O2, launched the Live 8 concert series.¹³³ When asked about the significance of this year’s Live 8 concerts on G8 leaders, an optimistic Bob Geldof, replied: “Mahatma Gandhi freed a continent. Martin Luther King freed a people. Nelson Mandela freed a country. It does work. They will listen.”¹³⁴

Dubbed the “biggest global live event in history”, the various concerts were attended by and broadcast to an estimated 85 percent of the world’s population, according to some sources.¹³⁵ Additionally, roughly 26 million people sent text messages the “Live 8 Live” petition in support of the MPH campaign.¹³⁶ Organisers of the event hoped that the astounding numbers and widespread support would further increase the pressure on G8 leaders to ‘Make Poverty History’.

The ten venues of the concerts included the UK (Hyde Park, London); France (Palais de Versailles, Paris); Germany (Siegessäule, Berlin); Italy (Circus Maximus, Rome); USA (Museum of Art,

¹²⁹ Focus on the Global South. “MPH: a sanitized campaign?” June 27, 2005.

¹³⁰ Inter-Press Service, “G8 Summit: A wristband and a concert aren’t enough, say activists”. July 4, 2005.

¹³¹ The Observer. “Inside story of the miracle show”. July 3, 2005; -Press Service. “Live 8 emotion imperfect, but an impetus”. July 3, 2005; Inter-Press Service, “G8 Summit: A wristband and a concert aren’t enough, say activists”. July 4, 2005.

¹³² People & Planet. “G8 2005: Background Briefing.” No date given.

¹³³ For further information, please visit: www.live8live.com

¹³⁴ BBC. “Live 8 success hailed by Geldof”. July 3, 2005.

¹³⁵ BBC. “Media spread Live 8 around globe.” July 3, 2005; The Observer. “Inside story of the miracle show”. July 3, 2005.

¹³⁶ Pakistan Mid-day News. “Live 8 puts pressure on G8 leaders”. July 4, 2005.

Philadelphia); Canada (Park Place, Barrie); Japan (Makuhari Messe, Tokyo); South Africa (Mary Fitzgerald Square, Newtown, Johannesburg); and Russia (Red Square, Moscow).¹³⁷

Key performers and celebrities at the various locations included Alicia Keys, Alpha Bondy, Annie Lennox, Barenaked Ladies, Bjork, Bob Geldof, Bon Jovi, Bono, Brian Wilson, Bryan Adams, Coldplay, Destiny's Child, Die Toten Hosen, DMC, Duran Duran, Eddie Izzard, Faith Hill, Francesco de Gregori, George Clooney, Greenday, James Brown, Jay Z, Jovanotti, Kofi Annan, Lenny Henry, Madonna, Mariah Carey, Midge Ure, Moralniy Kodex, Motley Crue, Neil Young, Nelson Mandela, Neneh Cherry, Pet Shop Boys, Pink Floyd, Placebo, REM, Sir Elton John, Sir Paul McCartney, Snow Patrol, Stevie Wonder, Sting, Susan Sarandon, Texas, The Corrs, The Cure, The Proclaimers, The Sugababes, The Tragically Hip, Tim Robbins, Travis, Will Smith, Zola, and Zucchero, among others.¹³⁸

Speaking on the impact of the Live 8 concerts on G8 leaders, organisers stated that "only time will tell if this summit is historic or not...What is true is that never before have so many people forced a change of policy onto the global agenda."¹³⁹ The website goes on to claim credit for a "staggering \$200m for those suffering death by starvation", "\$25 billion per annum for Africa to attack the structures of poverty", "10 million people alive because you danced for life", "20 million children in school because we played our guitars", "5 million orphans taken care of because we sang for joy", and claims that its "list excellence goes on". The website also goes on to thank the "great peaceful army of 3 billion who walked for those who could barely crawl".¹⁴⁰

Oxfam spokesperson Helen Palmer added that the event "sort of upped the ante to an extra degree. It has played a major role in bringing the message to millions more people and you can't knock that."¹⁴¹ Media reports stated that the "currency" of this year's concerts was "calculated simply in the weight of humanity" and represented an enormous "mandate for change".¹⁴² Other stories reported that the events marked a "triumph of emotion over economic arguments".¹⁴³ UN Secretary General Kofi Annan added, "This is really a united nations...the whole world has come together in solidarity with the poor. On behalf of the poor, the voiceless and the weak, I say thank you."¹⁴⁴ Even Gordon Brown was prompted to comment on the immensity of the events, acknowledging that the campaign had indeed influenced official negotiations. "I think you've seen that ministers around the world have been affected by the strength of public opinion...and it does have an impact," he stated.¹⁴⁵

¹³⁷ BBC. "Live 8 concerts: the line-up". May 31, 2005.

¹³⁸ The Observer. "Nine nations with a single voice." July 3, 2005; BBC. "Live 8 success hailed by Geldof". July 3, 2005; The Scotsman. "Film stars to take the stage for Live 8". July 6, 2005.

¹³⁹ www.live8live.com

¹⁴⁰ www.live8live.com

¹⁴¹ Reuters AlertNet. "Remember Live 8? Reviews mixed for charity stars". July 15, 2005.

¹⁴² The Observer. "Inside story of the miracle show". July 3, 2005.

¹⁴³ Inter-Press Service. "Live 8 emotion imperfect, but an impetus." July 3, 2005.

¹⁴⁴ BBC. "Live 8 success hailed by Geldof". July 3, 2005.

¹⁴⁵ Pakistan Mid-day News. "Live 8 puts pressure on G8 leaders". July 4, 2005.

Despite being hailed as the “day the world became one” and the “eighth wonder of the world”, however, the Live 8 events were also met with considerable criticism.¹⁴⁶ One of the first criticisms of Live 8 to surface came from London-based group, Black Information Link, who protested that the line-up for the ‘African benefit’ concerts was “hideously white”, including only one band from Africa.¹⁴⁷

Baaba Maal, a West African music superstar, also expressed his frustration with the lack of African representation. “The cause is African. The Live 8 concert should have had many more African musicians because it is all about poverty in Africa. If you don’t include African musicians in the fight against poverty, how can you help Africa build its culture which is key to development?”¹⁴⁸ Following his attempts to convince Bob Geldof to diversify the line-up and include more African artists, musician Peter Gabriel organised a parallel concert in Cornwall. The African-centred event, labelled “Africa Calling”, drew approximately 5 000 people.¹⁴⁹

Live 8 was also criticised for the way in which it represented Africans. In an Open Democracy article, Chukwu-Emeka Chikezie, a representative of the African Foundation for Development (Affor), stated: “The really corrosive damage of Live 8-type initiatives is twofold. First, they demoralise and disempower Africans—both in Africa and the diaspora—because they render Africans’ own agency invisible. Second, they undermine local, African-led initiatives and help destroy trust and relationships between African organisations—the very stuff of any movement that will author the next stage of Africa’s liberation.”¹⁵⁰

Randall Robinson, a member of the Jubilee Network, said that he was “plagued by a cheerless intuition that 10 years from now, we will all look back upon the Live 8 extravaganza as one of the greatest public relations frauds ever perpetrated against the African continent”. With no voice from Africans and no analysis of the colonial history of Africa, Robinson felt that Live 8 damagingly portrayed Africa as “hopeless, hapless, and pointedly responsible for its own economic predicament.”¹⁵¹

Even some newspaper articles stated their concerns that the concerts would “merely propagate deep-rooted Western-held stereotypes of a hapless continent rather than a vibrant land which wanted to help itself as desperately as it required assistance.”¹⁵²

In an article for Reuters, student Ben Wisener argued, “Live 8 and the lobbying surrounding the G8 summit have projected an image of Africans as pathetic victims.”¹⁵³ And, in a BBC article which surveyed African opinion on the concerts, the author wrote that “although some of the

¹⁴⁶ BBC. “Live 8 prompts rapturous response”. July 3, 2005.

¹⁴⁷ BBC. “Live 8 line-up ‘hideously white’”. June 2, 2005; The Observer. “Inside story of the miracle show”. July 3, 2005; UK Indymedia. “African activists: Make Poverty History is being co-opted”. July 8, 2005; Red Pepper. “Average, white band”. July 2005.

¹⁴⁸ Panos London Online. “The ‘nightingale’ sings”. July 5, 2005.

¹⁴⁹ Financial Times. “Top African artists banished to Eden”. July 4, 2005.

¹⁵⁰ Open Democracy. “African agency vs. the aid industry”. July 6, 2005.

¹⁵¹ Jubilee USA Network. “Live 8 in perspective.” July 7, 2005.

¹⁵² The Observer. “Inside story of the miracle show”. July 3, 2005.

¹⁵³ Reuters AlertNet. “What eggs will hatch from the Gleneagles nest?”. July 5, 2005.

African's who knew about the global concerts thought they were a good idea, others questioned why their own musicians had been sidelined.”¹⁵⁴

NGO and civil society opinions of the concerts were also mixed. Some NGOs and activists, including some from the MPH campaign, feared that the Live 8 shows would overshadow their own events. The fear of “pop diplomacy” seemed to grow as the concerts gained publicity around the world and groups who had worked for months on detailed campaigns recognised that Bono and Geldof were suddenly at the forefront of the G8 negotiations.¹⁵⁵ Comments were made that the “stage was stolen by a small number of violent protesters and two aging Irish rock stars,” and some groups questioned how Bono and Geldof had risen to the top of the summit agenda, managing to get private meetings with Bush when the Canadian Prime Minister could not.¹⁵⁶

Tensions between the Live 8 organisers and some anarchist groups flared when Midge Ure, one of the Live 8 organisers, in response to questions about whether anarchists would ‘hijack’ the Live 8, replied that it was Live 8, in fact, that was “hijacking the anarchists’ events”. As one activist explained, “In a negative sense, [Live 8] ‘hijacks’ them because it uses the momentum that these movements have built up around G8 summits for its own, very simple and naïve message...But in a positive sense, one could hope that it complements that momentum and helps to build greater pressure and visibility.”¹⁵⁷

Others, however, were less understanding. Neil Williams, an activist from the British socialist coalition ‘Respect’, argued that the politics of the G8 got somewhat lost at Live 8. “To some extent, Live 8 was like saying ‘we all need love’”, he said. “Yes,” he answered. “But where does that take us? The Live 8 music overshadowed the months of work for the Edinburgh demonstration and this will occur again next Wednesday (with the Long Walk to Justice march).”

¹⁵⁸

As with the MPH campaign, George Monbiot was also very outspoken against the Live 8 concerts. He and others condemned the Live 8 for being “high on celebrity octane” but low on political substance. “Geldof and Bono are in danger of turning a well-thought out campaign for full and unconditional debt relief into a philanthropic campaign,” insisting that neither of the two is qualified to determine whether or not world leaders should be congratulated or condemned for the debt relief package.¹⁵⁹ Meanwhile, other groups criticised the Live 8 for not addressing the problem of the war in Iraq. It was suggested, in fact, that Geldof told Live 8 performers not to make it into an issue.¹⁶⁰ The Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament (CND) also criticised Live 8 for failing to focus more on militarisation.

¹⁵⁴ BBC. “Live 8 success hailed by Geldof”. July 3, 2005.

¹⁵⁵ Inter-Press Service. “Pop diplomacy takes over”. July 6, 2005.

¹⁵⁶ Canadian Press. “Bono, Geldof and protesters upstage G8 leaders at summit in Scotland”. July 6, 2005.

¹⁵⁷ Inter-Press Service, “G8 Summit: A wristband and a concert aren’t enough, say activists”. July 4, 2005.

¹⁵⁸ Inter-Press Service, “G8 Summit: A wristband and a concert aren’t enough, say activists”. July 4, 2005.

¹⁵⁹ BBC. “Stars fighting poverty spark controversy”. June 26, 2005.

¹⁶⁰ Open Democracy. “Me Tarzan. Me save Africa”. July 4, 2005.

In an AlterNet article, the concerts were also berated for trivialising the issues under discussion at the G8. Despite hours of primetime coverage, the article argued, the event “held little in the way of content on the issues”. Aside from repeatedly calling the July 2nd, the “day that changed the world”, the article claimed that, like most of the mass media, the presenters seemed “more into engaging in sappy rock star adoration than exploring the larger mission of the show”.¹⁶¹ The ‘simplistic’ message of the Live 8 concerts also had activists asking whether a concert and a white wristband could ever go far enough. Some voiced concern that the “largest likely shift in perception could be a dubious one: from ignorance of Africa to pity for it.”¹⁶²

Speculating on the possible effects of the Live 8 phenomenon on civil society, John Pilger’s article in the New Statesmen in June 2005, also deemed the event trivialising.

Pilger asserted: “Africa’s imperial plunder and tragedy have been turned into a circus for the benefit of the so-called G8 leaders due in Scotland next month and those of us willing to be distracted by the barkers of the circus: the establishment media and its ‘celebrities’. The illusion of an anti-establishment crusade led by pop stars—a cultivated, controlling image of rebellion—serves to dilute a great political movement of anger.”¹⁶³ For others, the contradiction of “tapping your feet while watching people starve” as Live 8 videos of starving African children played overtop of the music was too disconcerting.¹⁶⁴

According to Canadian professor Michel Chossudovsky, the Live 8’s greatest shortcoming was its hidden corporate agenda. Chossudovsky claimed that, despite the altruistic image of the concerts, Live 8 generated “huge profits for its corporate sponsors”. Among the beneficiaries of the “multi-million dollar undertaking” are some of the world’s largest multinationals: AOL Time Warner, Ford Motor company, Volvo, Nokia, EMI Music Group, Walt Disney Company, ABC, etc. By securing broadcasting rights, online rights, TV air time, DVDs publishing contracts, and so forth, the “largest media advertising operation in history will line the pockets of the promoters, producers, corporate sponsors, not to mention the royalties accruing to the performers and ‘celebrities’”, said Chossudovsky. Although a small percentage of the proceeds might accrue to charitable organisations involved in developing countries, he stated, “This is not the stated objective of Live 8.”¹⁶⁵

As one US observer noted, it is also difficult to tell at this point in time whether Live 8 will have a lasting impact. “But,” he said, “I’m struck by how quickly it seems to have faded from memory. A week after the concert, it’s as if Live 8 never happened at all”.¹⁶⁶ According to SchNEWS, such events are not likely to have lasting impact because change takes place in the street, rather than at widely publicised, media events. “The global anti-capitalist movement has done more to resist the policies that cause poverty than some yester-year popstar, and while any publicity is great, it’s gonna take more than a pop concert to really oppose the G8’s policies”, SchNEWS wrote. “Who

¹⁶¹ AlterNet. “Live 8: Tour de force or farce?” July 6, 2005.

¹⁶² Inter-Press Service. “Live 8 emotion imperfect, but an impetus.” July 3, 2005.

¹⁶³ SpinWatch. “G8 Summit: a fraud and a circus”. June 28, 2005.

¹⁶⁴ Inter-Press Service. “Live 8 emotion imperfect, but an impetus.” July 3, 2005.

¹⁶⁵ Scoop Independent News. “Chossudovsky: Live 8 as corporate media bonanza”. July 7, 2005.

¹⁶⁶ Reuters AlertNet. “Remember Live 8? Reviews mixed for charity stars”. July 15, 2005.

have, historically, been the agents of change? And, importantly, who has the ability to change the way in which the world works today? The answer, of course, is not Bob and Bono. But neither is it Blair and Brown. It's ordinary, everyday people. It's us. It's you. Those who have the power not only to make poverty history but to make history itself are the same as they have always been: ordinary people who do extraordinary things";¹⁶⁷

Stop the War Demonstration

The Stop the War demonstration, organised by the Edinburgh Stop the War Coalition, took place on July 3, 2005 in Edinburgh.¹⁶⁸ Frustrated that the Make Poverty History campaign organisers would not allow them to march in the main march with their own banners or speak at the MPH rally, Stop the War organised its own event to focus attention on the war in Iraq and the links between war and poverty. Some anti-war protesters claimed that the "Blairites were stage managing the [MPH] protests from the shadows" and alleged that there was some secret deal between the popstars and the politicians to avoid the issue of war entirely.¹⁶⁹ Speakers at the event included MP George Galloway who denounced 'Sir Bob' and 'Sir Bono', the "soon to be Sir", for playing up to Bush and Blair rather than confronting them as war criminals.¹⁷⁰

Make Borders History Demonstration

The Make Borders History demonstration took place in Glasgow on July 3, 2005. The event included a tour of immigration controls and organisations involved in detaining and deporting asylum seekers.¹⁷¹

"Ideas to Change the World"/"Corporate Dream, Global Nightmare" Counter-Summit

The "Ideas to Change the World"/"Corporate Dream, Global Nightmare" counter-summit was held on July 3, 2005 in Edinburgh. The event was a joint effort of G8 Alternatives and War on Want, Friends of the Earth, World Development Movement, and People and Planet. Topics of discussion included war and imperialism, civil liberties, Africa, climate change, asylum and immigration, "nuclearism", corporate globalisation and privatisation, aid, trade, and debt. Guest speakers at the event included Walden Bello, Trevor Ngwane, Samir Amin, Susan George, George Monbiot, Berenice Celeyta, Meena Raman, The Yes Men, and others.

Speaking out on the issue of climate change, Friends of the Earth Chair Meena Raman blasted the G8 for "climate injustice". When just eight countries account for 45 percent of the emissions causing climate change, yet have only 13 percent of the world's people, that's climate injustice, she said.

Tatiana Roa Avendaño, Director of FOE Colombia, added: "Climate change is real and its impacts are already apparent now in Central and South America. Countries in the south are having to bear a triply unfair burden. More severe impacts of climate change, unfair impacts of measures designed to tackle climate change—such as new plantation forests from which the poor are

¹⁶⁷ SchNEWS. "G8 Special". July 1, 2005.

¹⁶⁸ For further information, please visit: www.edinburghstwtw.org.uk

¹⁶⁹ AlterNet. "Live 8: Tour de force or farce?" July 5, 2005.

¹⁷⁰ AlterNet. "Live 8: Tour de force or farce?" July 5, 2005.

¹⁷¹ For further information, please visit: www.makebordershistory.org

excluded, and devastating impacts of the continued quest for more oil. Instead of supporting more fossil fuel exploitation, the G8 must finance sustainable energy in impoverished countries, and find real solutions to deliver climate justice by reducing emissions at home where most of the emissions are actually produced.”¹⁷²

Over the course of the day, speakers and participants also discussed Shell Oil’s activities in Nigeria, Coca Cola’s impact on water resources in India, the upcoming WTO Ministerial meeting in Hong Kong, debt cancellation, anti-privatisation actions in Colombia, and the impacts of genetically-modified organisms on farming in Africa.¹⁷³

The Carnival for Full Enjoyment

The Carnival for Full Enjoyment, which took place in Edinburgh on July 4, was organised by anarchist activist group “Dissent!” Organisers of the event called upon anarchists, anti-capitalists, workers, migrants, students, benefit claimers, New Dealers, work refusers, pensioners, dreamers, duckers and divers” to resist the “daily grind of the institutions that plunge us into overwork, poverty, and debt.”¹⁷⁴

As opposed to “full employment”, the Carnival for Full Enjoyment was designed to be in solidarity with the powerful social movements of the global south, as a day of anti-establishment protest focussed on making “capitalism and wage slavery history” globally.¹⁷⁵ The event was also designed to reflect a strong belief in direct action, which, in the words of one activist, stems from the fact that “politicians have got us nowhere”. Direct action, therefore, is targeted against the institutions that are “keeping us down and ripping us off”. “Our vision is of a society that is run from the bottom up with grassroots control in all areas; where satisfaction of human needs is the greatest priority.”¹⁷⁶

The Carnival began with a short, colourful march with drums and whistles. Members of the anarchist/musical Pink & Silver bloc, as well as protesters dressed as clowns, black bloc, and bagpipers in helmets gathered in the streets. The Carnival kicked off with a festive and comic feel as protesters kissed police riot shields leaving lipstick marks and clowns offered carrots to police horses.¹⁷⁷

Despite attempts to keep the atmosphere ‘light’, however, security forces prepared for the worst. Following warnings from WOMBLES that they planned to cause “maximum disruption”, security forces feared that the group would target the financial district, including the Standard Life and the Royal Bank of Scotland buildings. As a result, the Carnvial quickly turned from “full enjoyment” to “full policing”, with protesters complaining of a virtual police state.¹⁷⁸

¹⁷² Friends of the Earth. “G8: Environmentalists speak on climate and corporate power”. July 3, 2005.

¹⁷³ Consumers International. “Make Poverty History”. July 2, 2005.

¹⁷⁴ Indymedia. “Carnival of Full Enjoyment”. July 4, 2005.

¹⁷⁵ Inter-Press Service. “Protesters prepare ‘warm’ welcome for world leaders”. July 2, 2005.

¹⁷⁶ BBC. “Politicians have got us nowhere”. July 4, 2005; Indymedia UK. “G8 the antiauthoritarians story”. July 12, 2005.

¹⁷⁷ The Guardian. “Police scuffle with protesters before G8”. July 4, 2005.

¹⁷⁸ Indymedia UK. “Gleneagles: Repression, Resistance, and Clowns”. July 15, 2005.

However, police efforts to detain the clowns proved more amusing for onlookers than serious. The clowns responded to the police in high-pitched voices, dancing around, making jokes, giggling while police searches turned up only feather dusters, water pistols, and soapy bubbles—not weapons. Onlookers also laughed as the crowd used a large cardboard cat to scare off the jittery police horses, while some waited to see how many clowns the police could fit into a paddy wagon.

179

In other parts of the city, however, ‘cat and mouse’ chases with the police, led to the interruption of traffic on Princes Street near the Scott Monument and several arrests for throwing objects at the police.¹⁸⁰ Reports stated that protesters launched park benches, glass bottles, and concrete slabs at authorities, and also uprooted flowers, and taunted the police¹⁸¹ Over the course of the day, more than 20 injuries (both police and protesters) were reported.¹⁸² While some officers alleged that the group responsible for most of the day’s chaos was the “Rebel Clown Army”, others pointed the finger at foreign groups such as “Ya Basta”, the black bloc, WOMBLES, and various French, German, Spanish, and Danish groups as the cause of the troubles.¹⁸³

Evaluations of the appropriateness of the police response to the Carnival ranged widely. Some activists accused the police of using “heavy handed tactics”, to which the police responded that their actions were “proportionate.”¹⁸⁴ Assistant Chief Constable Tom Halpin further justified the police response based on “evidence of weapons being brought into the city”, but Indymedia reports of the same event claimed that the police had antagonised the protesters and were overstating the situation with claims that “riots” had taken place.¹⁸⁵ In another Indymedia report, one activist stated that the police over-reaction was due to a “lot of very nervous twitchy police who were disorganised and seemingly without a proper idea of what they were doing.”¹⁸⁶

Indymedia writers and mainstream media also described various incidents of police violence—from knocking people to the ground, beating them with riot shields, injuries from those running from police charge/attack, and penning in large groups of people without water, then searching, photographing, and demanding personal info; argued that there were no black bloc or violent protesters causing riots, but rather, that the police were attempting to justify their presence in the city.¹⁸⁷

¹⁷⁹ Edinburgh Evening News. “The Carnival turns into anarchy”. July 5, 2005.

¹⁸⁰ BBC. “Smiles fade as protest turns sour”. July 4, 2005.

¹⁸¹ Edinburgh Evening News. “They came looking for trouble...they got their wish”. July 5, 2005; Edinburgh Evening News. “The nightmare comes true”. July 5, 2005.

¹⁸² BBC. “Smiles fade as protest turns sour”. July 4, 2005.

¹⁸³ Edinburgh Evening News. “The nightmare comes true”. July 5, 2005; Edinburgh Evening News. “Batons drawn in the battle of Princes Street”, July 5, 2005; Edinburgh Evening News. “The Carnival turns into anarchy”. July 5, 2005; Indymedia. “Anarchists ruin Sir Bob’s call for peaceful protest at the G8 Summit”. July 5, 2005.

¹⁸⁴ BBC. “G8 protest accused set for court”. July 5, 2005.

¹⁸⁵ BBC. “G8 protest accused set for court”. July 5, 2005.

¹⁸⁶ Indymedia UK. “There were no ‘riots’ in Edinburgh this afternoon”. July 4, 2005; Indymedia. “Carnival of Full Enjoyment”. July 4, 2005; Edinburgh Evening News. “The Carnival turns into anarchy”. July 5, 2005.

¹⁸⁷ Indymedia UK. “There were no ‘riots’ in Edinburgh this afternoon”. July 4, 2005; Indymedia. “Carnival of Full Enjoyment”. July 4, 2005; Edinburgh Evening News. “The Carnival turns into anarchy”. July 5, 2005.

Scottish Justice Minister Cathy Jamieson, however, blamed the protesters for bringing the situation upon themselves. “It is sad and disappointing that a hard core of protesters are more interested in protest for protest’s sake and not joining the rest of the country in focussing on the real issues of poverty and climate change”. Midge Ure, one of the organisers of Live 8 concerts, also criticised the Carnival, calling it “daft” and condemning those who participated in it. “What we have been trying to do is put pressure on the leaders of the G8 summit to make a real change in the world, but I don’t even know what these people want...This carnival is just daft, because we are already getting movement from the G8 group on these issues. Anyone who wants to cause trouble on the streets should go home”. Ewan Hunter, a representative of the Hunter Foundation added, “These people are just taking the attention away from all the good work done by the Make Poverty History campaign in pursuing their own agenda. There is no place for them here.”¹⁸⁸

On the other hand, Green Member of Scottish Parliament Mark Ballard faulted the police for the clash. He argued, “Police were rushing into the crowd and antagonising them. It was the most surreal and bizarre policing I have ever seen...Police seemed to be inflaming the situation by letting innocent bystanders wander into the areas of trouble, then not letting them exit.”¹⁸⁹

Faslane Nuclear Naval Base Blockade

Organised by anti-nuclear groups Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament (CND), Campaign Against the Arms Trade (CAAT), and Trident Ploughshares, the July 4 blockade of Faslane was aimed at “highlighting the link between war and poverty and the way in which the military is used to enforce destructive globalisation.”¹⁹⁰ According to the event’s website, “...[organisers] believe it is impossible to divorce issues of war and militarism from issues of global poverty and sustainability...In short, war creates poverty and poverty creates war.” The site also points to the £48 per second that the UK alone spends on its nuclear weapons and argues that this money could be “better spent on avoiding future conflicts and providing clean water, healthcare and education around the world.”¹⁹¹

Nearly 2 000 people gathered at the Faslane to “shut it down for the day”, but found the base had already closed preventatively. Somewhat jokingly, activists claimed, “Nukes are Afraid of Protesters.”¹⁹² The “blockade” continued regardless, with a non-violent protest including politicians, activists, members of the church, and others, music (from a pedal-powered tricycle generator), drums, street theatre, and speeches/presentations from parliamentarians, church leaders, Dissent! campaigners, and clowns from CIRCA.

Speaking to the crowd, retired vicar David Platt stated, “I think that nuclear weapons are inherently immoral. They are indiscriminate—you can’t distinguish between enemies and civilians. They are illegal, they are irresponsible, and totally irrelevant. If we are to make poverty history, we must make war history.”¹⁹³

¹⁸⁸ Edinburgh Evening News. “Ure urges anarchists ‘go home’”. July 5, 2005.

¹⁸⁹ BBC. “G8 protest accused set for court”. July 5, 2005.

¹⁹⁰ The Guardian. “Hundreds protest at nuclear base”. July 4, 2005.

¹⁹¹ Faslane G8 Blockade Briefing. For further information, please visit: www.faslaneg8.com

¹⁹² Inter-Press Service, “Nukes are afraid of protesters”. July 4, 2005.

¹⁹³ The Guardian. “Hundreds protest at nuclear base.” July 4, 2005.

Scottish Socialist MP and party leader Tommy Sheridan added, “Faslane is a carbuncle on the face of Scotland. It despoils our landscape, and represents all that’s wrong with the G8 meeting in Gleneagles, spending billions on destruction when we are standing here today for peace and solidarity.”¹⁹⁴ Like many of the protesters present at the blockade, Sheridan called for Faslane to be closed not just for one day, but permanently.¹⁹⁵

During speeches, anti-nuclear activists also pointed out that, with four of the G8 countries (France, Britain, US, and Russia) holding nuclear weapons, it is hypocritical for the G8 to force Iran to get rid of nuclear weapons as long as these countries continue to hold them themselves.

¹⁹⁶

Commenting on the impact of the event, Kate Hudson, UK Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament (CND) exclaimed, “It is a big success, the biggest march ever here in Faslane...We are giving a strong message to the G8 leaders: to put an end to their nuclear hypocrisy and disarm nuclear weapons”. Hudson also pointed out that Bush’s proposal to double aid to Africa in the next two years is still only equivalent to two days of American defence expenditures. “That puts into perspective the G8 talk about helping the poor countries,” she said.¹⁹⁷ Another organiser said that the protest will draw attention to the militarisation of the world. “The action will point out the criminal behaviour of spending so much money on weapons while half the world starves”, as well as the “hypocrisy of talking about poverty without mentioning war”.¹⁹⁸

The Glasgow Campaign to Welcome Refugees

The Glasgow Campaign to Welcome Refugees took place at the Dungavel Detention Centre in Glasgow on July 5, 2005. The event was geared at protesting both the restrictive immigration policies and the practice of removal of immigrants from Scotland.

The protest, called “Voices across Barriers”, brought busses of activists from Glasgow and Edinburgh to the Dungavel Detention centre to call for its permanent closure. Glasgow Campaign to Welcome Refugees spokesperson Mark Brown described the groups’ goals. “We feel the G8 should stop policing borders and tear them down and bring about the closure of places like Dungavel and every other detention centre for good.”

A survey estimated that 2 000 people attended the event. According to protester Pam Currie, it was important to focus on Dungavel as it represents a “blight on the Scottish landscape...and a disgrace that in the 21st century people are locked up without having committed any crime or having had a trial”.¹⁹⁹

¹⁹⁴ The Guardian. “Hundreds protest at nuclear base.” July 4, 2005.

¹⁹⁵ Inter-Press Service, “Nukes are afraid of protesters”. July 4, 2005; Agence France Presse, “Final preparations under way for G8 summit, amidst protest”. July 5, 2005.

¹⁹⁶ Inter-Press Service, “Nukes are afraid of protesters”. July 4, 2005.

¹⁹⁷ Inter-Press Service, “Nukes are afraid of protesters”. July 4, 2005.

¹⁹⁸ Inter-Press Service. “Protesters prepare ‘warm’ welcome for world leaders”. July 2, 2005.

¹⁹⁹ BBC. “Anti G8 protest at asylum centre”. July 5, 2005.

Although the Home Office had pre-emptively emptied the centre of its detainees for the duration of the summit, clashes between protesters and police took place regardless.

One group of protesters complained of police harassment as officers tried to separate a group of roughly 100 activists who arrived late from the main group. Although police eventually allowed them to join the group, human rights lawyer Aamer Anwar condemned the tight security, calling it a “police state.” Anwar also commented, “This is a legal protest but what I have seen is deliberate intimidation. It is oppressive. I believe this has been a testing ground for tomorrow and that causes me concern. There seems to be a hidden agenda to wind people up before the Gleneagles summit.” Fatima Uygun, another demonstrator added, “I think the police are deliberately provoking people and deliberately making it so they don’t have a peaceful protest.”²⁰⁰

“Global Warming 8”

The “Global Warming 8” climate change protest took place on July 5, 2005 in Edinburgh. The event was organised by the Working Group on Development and Climate Change, including ActionAid, the Catholic Institute for International Relations, Christian Aid, Columban Faith and Justice, Friends of the Earth, Greenpeace, Institute of Development Studies, the International Institute for Environment and Development, ITDG Practical Action, the New Economics Foundation, Operation Noah, Oxfam, People & Planet, Royal Society for the Protection of Birds, Tearfund, TERI Europe, Water Aid, World Vision, and WWF.²⁰¹

The event included speakers from China, Columbia, Honduras, India, Nepal, Kenya, Nigeria, Tanzania, and Zambia, as well as commentary from Bob Watson, former Chairman of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change and Mary Robinson, former President of Ireland and United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights.

As part of the protest, activists carried giant ‘waves’ to the Grangemouth oil refinery to challenge the G8 to stop serving the interests of the oil industry and start delivering climate justice for the world’s poorest people. According to organisers, the aim of the action was to show the refinery “sinking beneath the waves” in order to highlight the urgent need to tackle climate change.

Garry Glass, a spokesperson from People and Planet summarised the rationale behind the event. “We are taking action to tackle climate change at its very source. We realise that people’s livelihoods depend on the industry in Grangemouth and that is why we would like to put pressure on the oil industry to start a just transition to secure more sustainable jobs for the community before oil depletion and climate change become critical.”²⁰²

Beacons of Dissent

On the evening of July 5, the night before the summit opened, “beacons of dissent” were lit across the Scottish countryside to send a clear message that the “G8 ‘leaders’ were not welcome.” Beacons of solidarity were also lit elsewhere across the UK.

²⁰⁰ BBC. “Anti G8 protest at asylum centre”. July 5, 2005.

²⁰¹ For further information, please visit: www.itdg.org/?id=gw8

²⁰² Friends of the Earth Scotland. “Waves to submerge Grangemouth oil refinery”. July 5, 2005.

Another World is Possible: March on Gleneagles

The “Another World is Possible” march on Gleneagles was planned by G8 Alternatives and Peoples’ Global Action. The march, which began in Auchterarder, a neighbouring town to Gleneagles, took place on July 6, 2005. Busloads of protesters had planned to converge in Auchterarder from Glasgow, Edinburgh, Stirling, and other neighbouring towns. An estimated 5 000 to 10 000 protesters took part in the march, but some were unable to make it to the Gleneagles site.²⁰³

Although the right to protest had been won by protesters, permitting them to march from Auchterarder to the perimeter fence of the G8 summit site, officials initially denied this right fearing that public safety could not be guaranteed. The security decision was taken following skirmishes between campers at the Eco-village in Stirling and police the night before.²⁰⁴ When security forces later attempted to limit the protest numbers to 5 000, the crowd was enraged, arguing that police had previously authorised an unlimited number of protesters. In response, the group threatened to hold a rally in front of the US Embassy in Edinburgh if the march was not permitted. Indeed, those who were not able to get on the buses destined for Auchterarder staged a series of marches around the capital.²⁰⁵

Gillian Hubbard, one of the G8 Alternatives organisers, called upon the police to recognise civil liberties. “I’m sure all of you will agree that this would have been a travesty of democracy if we were not allowed to protest against the warmongers,” she claimed. Lindsey German, one of the speakers from the stage at the rally, clarified her perspective. “The G8 leaders do not wear masks or hoods, but are responsible for the death of millions of people in the world. They say we are violent, but we have seen much more violence coming from them, but all at once.”²⁰⁶ Many of the individual protesters also clarified that they were “not there for trouble, but to deliver their message to world leaders”.²⁰⁷

As the marchers wound through the few streets of Auchterarder and disrupted the traffic in the bigger cities, they chanted “Freedom for people, not for trade”, “Whose streets? Our streets!”, and “People have the power, we’re growing stronger by the hour.”²⁰⁸ In Auchterarder, groups of CIRCA clowns entertained young children while speakers held the main stage. Calling on the media to report the event accurately, George Galloway shouted out to the crowds: “There is no violence here. The only violence is inside the minds of the eight men meeting in the hotel nearby.”²⁰⁹

²⁰³ Inter-Press Service. “‘Siege’ at Gleneagles”. July 6, 2005; The Guardian. “10 000 march and protesters fight running battles with riot police”. July 7, 2005.

²⁰⁴ BBC. “Protesters breach G8 march route”. July 6, 2005.

²⁰⁵ The Scotsman. “Battle lines drawn for Gleneagles siege”. July 6, 2005; Inter-Press Service. “‘Siege’ at Gleneagles”. July 6, 2005; The Scotsman. “Day of hope turns to day of violence”. July 7, 2005; BBC. “Marchers take to capital streets”. July 6, 2005.

²⁰⁶ BBC. “Protesters breach G8 march route”. July 6, 2005.

²⁰⁷ BBC. “Day of uncertainty and contrasts”, July 7, 2005.

²⁰⁸ BBC. “Day of uncertainty and contrasts”, July 7, 2005.

²⁰⁹ BBC. “Day of uncertainty and contrasts”, July 7, 2005.

Despite the overwhelmingly calm nature of the march, however, a small group broke from the planned route and charged the security fence separating the protesters from the Gleneagles Hotel, 500 m away. Although some of the activists were able to temporarily breach the fence, they were met with heavy police presence. Officers on foot in full riot gear and mounted police were prepared to fend off any security breaches with sub-machine guns and pistols.²¹⁰

The incident was met with a critical response from Scottish First Minister Jack McConnell. “My message today to them [the protesters] would be that I would like to take each of you individually and sit you in a village in Malawi, watching children dying, and then see if you think you have contributed at all to saving their lives by your action this week in Scotland.” Chief Constable Peter Wilson then warned against further attempts to breach security. “Softball is over. We are going to engage these people and we are going to engage them robustly”.²¹¹

The People’s Open Golfing Tournament

Organised by the People’s Golf Association (PGA) and Dissent!, the Open Golfing Tournament had very little to do with golfing. Instead, an estimated 4 000 people gathered at the Stirling Eco-village and nearby locations on July 6 and 7, 2005, to ‘disrupt’ the Gleneagles summit, both on the Gleneagles course and off it.²¹²

Groups of activists slept overnight in the pouring rain in an effort to disrupt the early traffic en route to the summit with a series of blockades and roaming protests. Using a combination of diverse tactics and no central plan, the spontaneity of the effort effectively frustrated and thwarted police efforts to dismantle the blockades. The strategy, decided upon in earlier planning sessions at events like the World Social Forum and in workshops at the Stirling Eco-village, was to not ‘head for the red zone’, but rather, to ‘isolate the G8 leaders.’²¹³

Some of those involved in the blockades believe they came close to completely shutting down the summit. However, communications difficulties between the different affinity groups prevented a complete blockade. Delays and partial blockades of the A9, the M9, and various roads in Edinburgh, Auchterarder, Crieff, and Yetts o’Muckhart were deemed “major victories.”²¹⁴

Tree8

Tree8, a nationwide tree-planting initiative, took place July 6-8, 2005, in Burkina Faso to coincide with the G8 and its two key themes: Africa and climate change. Organised with the support of British environmental charity TREE AID, the Burkinabe government planted a number of trees, including eight symbolic baobab trees for the G8 nations. Organiser and Environment Minister Laurent Sedogo explained the purpose of the event. “The Burkinabe national tree planting is a physical acknowledgement of the debt forgiveness granted by G8 leaders and encourages them

²¹⁰ The Scotsman. “Battle lines drawn for Gleneagles siege”. July 6, 2005; BBC. “Day of uncertainty and contrasts”, July 7, 2005; Inter-Press Service. “‘Siege’ at Gleneagles”. July 6, 2005.

²¹¹ The Scotsman. “Day of hope turns to day of violence”. July 7, 2005.

²¹² For further information, please visit: www.dissent.org.uk/pga.html or www.indymedia.org.uk/en/2005/07/315730

²¹³ ResistG82005 listserve. “Blockading the G8: personal accounts”. July 13, 2005.

²¹⁴ Indymedia UK. “The anti-authoritarians’ story: this is how we do it”. July 12, 2005.

to continue their efforts to assist African countries like Burkina Faso, to develop through our own industry and ingenuity.”²¹⁵

Decentralised Actions on Climate Change

Decentralised actions against climate change took place in various locations across Scotland and around the world on July 8, 2005. One of these events was the “climate alarm”, sponsored by Friends of the Earth. At 13:45, organisers sounded alarms to highlight the injustice of G8 nations accounting for 45 percent of the global carbon dioxide emissions, while only having 13 percent of the world’s population; hence, 13:45.

While Friends of the Earth set off alarms outside of the summit in Gleneagles, communities around Scotland, the UK, Germany, Spain, USA, Canada, Italy, and France sounded their own alarms in solidarity. Friends of the Earth also explained that the climate alarm doubled as a form of protest against the G8’s practice of “hiding itself away” in remote locations where they do not hear the messages of protesters. This alarm, they explained, was designed to send a protest which is loud and clear.²¹⁶

Local firefighters, however, were not impressed with the ‘alarms’ as they feared that they would “compromise the lives of people in genuine emergency.”²¹⁷

“Boogie on the Bridge”: Climate Change and Anti-M74 Extension Protest

The “Boogie on the Bridge” protest against climate change and the M74 extension took place on July 8, 2005, in Glasgow. The action was coordinated by JAM74 (Joint Action on the M74), Transform Scotland, and Friends of the Earth Scotland.

As part of the decentralised actions against the “root causes of climate change”, protesters gathered on the Commerce Street Bridge in Glasgow and blocked it for five hours in protest of climate change, pollution, oil-based capitalism, and nuclear power. According to one protester at the event, “There cannot be any end to global warming without ending the oil-fuelled capitalist system that causes it.” Calling for a “radical rethink” of our societies to drastically cut our energy consumption, many of the protesters pointed to Stirling eco-village as a living example and first step towards change.²¹⁸

While CIRCA clowns and climate change apes hopped around on the bridge, others simply waved placards stating: “Rich pop stars dining with war criminals won’t stop poverty or climate change”, “G8 sponsored by corporations carving up Africa: Shell, De Beers, British Petroleum, Rio Tinto, IMF, WB”, and “Please close the G8 behind you.” Solidarity actions took place in Venezuela, New Zealand, San Francisco-USA, Australia, and the Philippines.²¹⁹

²¹⁵ AllAfrica.com. “Burkina Faso marks G8 summit with nationwide tree planting: TREE8”. July 5, 2005.

²¹⁶ Friends of the Earth Scotland. “Climate Justice: help us to lobby G8”. No Date Given.

²¹⁷ The Herald. “False alarm fears over G8 summit protest”. May 11, 2005.

²¹⁸ Inter-Press Service. “No solutions here to ‘climate chaos’—activists”. July 9, 2005.

²¹⁹ Inter-Press Service. “No solutions here to ‘climate chaos’—activists”. July 9, 2005.

Many of the protesters also gathered to voice their opposition to the planned extension of the M74, Britain's biggest new road building scheme expected to cost at least 500 million GBP.²²⁰ The extension, which is set to be completed by 2008 has proven highly controversial, with one Member of Scottish Parliament describing it as a "five-mile, six lane monster defacing Glasgow." The extension is set to cover some currently unused lands, but also homes, businesses and historic buildings.

While proponents point to the potential economic benefits from revitalising the area, as well as eased congestion, and job creation, opponents dismiss these claims, arguing that more roads will only increase traffic, emissions, noise and environmental damage. They would rather see improvements to public transport and 'no-car' lanes on the M8 than more road extensions. Besides, they argued, roughly 60 percent of Glaswegians do not have access to a car.²²¹

The Eco-village

Based in Stirling, Scotland, the Eco-village was home to some 3 500 protesters from July 2 to 9, 2005.²²² Roughly 35 km from the Gleneagles summit site, the camp was located on the banks of the River Forth, overlooked by the Ochil hills and the William Wallace (Braveheart) Monument.

Divided into various "barrios" (self-organised tent communities), the camp operated as a "horizon", organised horizontally rather than hierarchically. Eating, camping, and meeting areas were joined by a central corridor lined with activist support tents, eight different collective kitchens, medical services, an independent media centre (Indymedia), a trauma support centre, an action training centre, and large tents for village "spokescouncils". Affinity flags from different groups, including the red and black anarchist flags and the skull and cross-bone flags of pirates, were hoisted above the tents.²²³

The Eco-village, as its name implies, also sought to minimise its ecological impact. The campsite featured waste recycling, low impact and sustainable energy sources based on wind and solar energy, composting toilets, an area to treat grey water with natural filters, biodiesel, and local food purchasing from sources like cooperatives and organic food distributors. As an example of sustainable ways of living and non-hierarchical methods of organising, the Eco-village stands in direct opposition to the G8's poverty-making, undemocratic, and ecologically-devastating policies, said one of the Dissent! campers.²²⁴

As another camper explained, the Eco-village also proves that a transition from oil-based energy to more sustainable energy is possible, but that change starts small. "The slave trade was to the 18th century what oil is to us now", she said. "Everything they had depended on slaves. But over the course of decades, everyone from landed gentry to housewives realised the injustice and rose

²²⁰ Corporate Watch. "G8 Report Update: The M74". No Date Given.

²²¹ Corporate Watch. "G8 Report Update: The M74". No Date Given.

²²² The Scotsman. "Battle lines drawn for Gleneagles siege". July 6, 2005.

²²³ Indymedia UK. "G8, the antiauthoritarians' story". July 12, 2005.

²²⁴ BBC. "Eco-village 'is model for us all'". July 5, 2005.

up against it...I believe it's only a matter of time before the same thing happens with the damage we are doing to the planet.”²²⁵

However, some of the mainstream media expressed frustration in reporting on the Eco-village given that they were denied access to the camp and, given the horizontal nature of organisation, no single spokesperson could be identified for interviews or questions.

“C8”

in Dunblane, Scotland, from July 3 to 5, 2005, the “C8” Children’s Forum was the first of its kind—a gathering of young people aged 11 to 18 from the world’s poorest and richest countries. Sponsored by UNICEF, the event brought 17 children from Bhutan, Moldova, Yemen, Guinea, Sierra Leone, Cambodia, Lesotho, Bolivia, UK, France, Germany, and Italy together with the aim of producing a manifesto for the G8 leaders in Gleneagles. The conference was opened by UNICEF ambassador Ewan McGregor and Scottish violinist Nicola Benedetti.²²⁶

Explaining the significance of the event, McGregor said: “More than 100 million children are unable to go to school, there are 15 million children orphaned by AIDS throughout the world, and there are one billion children living in poverty around the globe...Next week at the G8 summit, these eight leaders are going to have at their finger tips the power to make extraordinary changes in the world, truly to make poverty history for these people.”

Eleven year old participant Aminata Palmer from Sierra Leone commented, “I want the G8 leaders to help stop suffering among children in the world. People are suffering, especially in my country. They have the power and money to change things. They have everything. I don’t know how they change things, but they will.”

The C8 ended with the issuing of a communiqué, in which the children urged, “In making these recommendations, we place our faith in you—recalling that you too were once a child—and hope that your commitment to being a member of the human race will influence your decisions.”

The communiqué called for G8 leaders to eliminate poverty now; ensure free quality education for all; protect children by supporting initiatives to eliminate all forms of violence against them; support the creation of children's commissioners and decision-making opportunities in every country; ensure accountability of governments; promote democracy, equality and representation; make anti-retroviral drugs, therapy, and condoms freely available to all; support programmes for the protection, education and health of street and working children; support children's participation in monitoring the protection of the natural environment; implement the Kyoto Protocol; support governments to establish clean water and quality sanitation facilities in schools and communities; and, cancel debt and promote fair trade to assure funds are generated for

²²⁵ BBC. “Eco-village ‘is model for us all’”. July 5, 2005.

²²⁶ For further information, please visit:

www.unicef.org.uk/press/photogalleries/gallery.asp?gallery_id=17&nodeid=g17§ion=5

comprehensive free health services and nutritious food, so that children do not die of preventable diseases such as malaria and tuberculosis.²²⁷

Sara Epstein, a representative of UNICEF stated that the event was important because it “gave children a voice.” As organisers of the C8 had aimed for a truly child-driven conference, they felt it was important for UNICEF not to influence their debate and allow the views of the participants to be expressed.²²⁸

“J8”

The “J8” or Junior 8 Forum took place in early July in Edinburgh. The three-day forum engaged participants aged 13 to 16 in a series of discussions and debates on the main issues under discussion at the G8: international development, trade, climate change, health, Africa, etc.²²⁹

Like the C8, the J8 also drafted its own communiqué, which was presented to Tony Blair on the first day of the G8 summit. The six-point communiqué on Africa and climate change called for an “Integrated Climate Economy”, greater understanding of the environmental implications of individuals’ actions, the creation of an international symbol to denote energy efficient and environmentally friendly products, the integration of renewable energy micro-generation technology into every new building, the prioritisation of “basics” (as outlined by the MDGs), and a partnership and capacity-building approach to working with Africa.

OFFICIAL OUTCOMES

The official Gleneagles communiqué outlined in detail the discussions and decisions taken at the summit.²³⁰ Following their condemnation of the “barbaric attacks on London”, the communiqué listed the following notable agreements.

Climate Change

Following talks with the leaders of Brazil, China, India, Mexico, and South Africa as well as the heads of the International Energy Agency, the International Monetary Fund, the United Nations, the World Bank, and the World Trade Organisation, the group agreed:

- to issue a statement setting out a common purpose in tackling climate change, promoting clean energy, and achieving sustainable development
- that climate change is happening now, that human activity is contributing to it, and that it could have global effects

²²⁷ Inter-Press Service. “Did someone say C8?” July 6, 2005.

²²⁸ BBC. “Youngsters stage ‘C8’ gathering”. July 3, 2005; Inter-Press Service. “Did someone say C8?” July 6, 2005.

²²⁹ For further information, please visit: www.j8changetheworld.com

²³⁰ For further information, please visit: www.fco.gov.uk/Files/kfile/PostG8_Gleneagles_Communique.0.pdf. The Chair’s Summary of the Summit can be found in Appendix C.

- to take urgent action, as set out in the Gleneagles Plan of Action, including measures to develop markets for clean energy technologies, to increase their availability in developing countries, and to help vulnerable communities adapt to the impact of climate change
- to involve the leaders of emerging economy countries in further discussions and efforts
- to advance the global effort to tackle climate change at the UN Climate Change Conference in Montreal later this year

Africa and Development

Following discussions with the leaders of Algeria, Ethiopia, Ghana, Nigeria, Senegal, South Africa, and Tanzania and the heads of the African Union Commission, the International Monetary Fund, the United Nations, and the World Bank, the group agreed:

- that the G8 and its African partners share a common interest in building a strong, peaceful, and prosperous Africa
- to provide a comprehensive plan to support Africa's progress including:
 - extra resources for African peacekeeping forces
 - enhanced support for greater democracy, governance, and transparency
 - greater investment in health and education
 - efforts to stimulate growth, improve investment, and make trade work
 - substantial extra resources for countries committed to development, democracy, transparency, and good governance
- that poor countries must decide and lead their own development strategies and economic policies
- to double aid for Africa by 2010, meaning:
 - Aid for all developing countries will increase, according to the OECD, by around \$50bn per year by 2010, of which at least \$25bn extra per year for Africa.
 - A group of G8 and other countries will also take forward innovative financing mechanisms including the International Finance Facility (IFF) for immunisation, an air-ticket solidarity levy and the IFF to deliver and bring forward the financing, and a working group will consider the implementation of these mechanisms
- that all of the debts owed by eligible heavily indebted poor countries to International Development Association (IDA), the International Monetary Fund and the African Development Fund should be cancelled, as set out in our Finance Ministers agreement on June 11, 2005
- to support the Paris Club decision to write off around \$17 billion of Nigeria's debt

- to take this spirit forward to the UN Millennium Review Summit in New York in September, and ensure a successful conclusion to the Doha Development Agenda

The Global Economy, Oil, and Trade

Discussions focussed on the outlook for global economic growth, including the volatility of oil prices. The group:

- agreed to redouble our efforts to achieve a successful conclusion across the whole of the Doha Development Agenda in an attempt to ensure an outline agreement by the WTO Hong Kong Ministerial in December, and a final agreement in 2006
- re-affirmed their commitment to open markets more widely to trade in agricultural goods, industrial goods and services, and in agriculture
- agreed to reduce trade distorting domestic subsidies and eliminate all forms of export subsidies by a credible end date
- committed to address products of interest to Least Developed Countries in the negotiations, and to ensure Least Developed Countries have the flexibility to decide their own economic strategies

Regional Issues and Proliferation

Following talks with James Wolfensohn, the Quartet's Special Envoy for Disengagement and a briefing on Israeli disengagement from Gaza and parts of the West Bank, the group:

- reconfirmed their commitment to the Partnership for Progress and a Common Future with the Region of the Broader Middle East and North Africa
- underlined their support for UN work on post-tsunami humanitarian aid and reconstruction
- reaffirmed that the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and their delivery systems, together with international terrorism, remain the pre-eminent threats to international peace and security, while expressing particular concern about the threat of proliferation in North Korea and Iran.
- discussed the situations in Sudan and in Iraq and issued statements on both, as well as statements on the Middle East Peace Process, the Broader Middle East and North Africa Initiative, the Indian Ocean disaster, and counter-proliferation, and a progress report on the Secure and Facilitated Travel Initiative (SAFTI).
- discussed the situation in Zimbabwe and called on the Zimbabwean authorities to address immediately the situation they have created, and respect human rights and the rule of law

- expressed concern at the deteriorating situation in Haiti and underlined the need for sustained international engagement
- agreed that the progress made at Gleneagles should contribute to a clear and ambitious outcome at the UN Millennium Review Summit in September

Regarding the official Gleneagles outcomes, Blair stated that he was relatively satisfied. “People always say that it is never enough, but you find that these things are always said by the people who are not actually getting their hands dirty trying to make things better...Politics is about getting things done, step by step, making progress. This is big progress and we should be proud of it”.²³¹ He later added, “It is not the end of poverty in Africa, but the hope that it can be ended. It is not all that everyone wanted, but it is progress, real and achievable progress. It is the definitive expression of our will to act in the face of disease and conflict that is preventable.”²³²

On climate change, seen as the most contentious topic at the summit, Blair also stated that he had met his objectives. According to sources, Blair had sought: a statement affirming the scientific evidence that climate change taking place, a promise of ‘urgent action’, and a pathway dialogue on post-Kyoto—all of which were agreed to in the communiqué.²³³

Blair was also reportedly pleased that agreement had been made to continue discussions in Montreal this year. “What we haven’t done is renegotiate a different treaty or set a new set of targets. What we have done, however, is to establish a pathway back to an international consensus.” In the meantime, it is expected that he will continue pushing, using the influence of the UK presidency of the EU, to overcome the impasse on what will happen after Kyoto expires in 2012.²³⁴

Regarding the \$3 billion granted to the Palestinian Authority for investment in infrastructure in order “to allow two states, Israel and Palestine, two peoples, and two religions to live side by side in peace”, Blair commented, “We offer today this contrast with the politics of terror.”²³⁵

On Africa, Blair warned that African governments have to bear the burden of putting their own houses in order. He stated, “None of [these proposals] can be implemented and improve the lives of African citizens without significant improvements in standards of governance, transparency, and accountability...This is a partnership, not an act of charity. In the end, only Africans can lead and shape Africa.”²³⁶

²³¹ Times Online. “Blair backs G8’s ‘big progress’ on poverty and AIDS”. July 8, 2005.

²³² Times Online. “Blair backs G8’s ‘big progress’ on poverty and AIDS”. July 8, 2005.

²³³ Financial Times. “Climate change accord meets objectives, claims Blair”. July 10, 2005.

²³⁴ Reuters. “G8 agree on need for climate action, but no targets”. July 8, 2005; BBC. “G8 calls for new climate dialogue”. July 8, 2005.

²³⁵ Taipei Times. “G8 hands Africa billions”. July 9, 2005; BBC. “G8 pledges \$3 billion to Palestinians”. July 8, 2005.

²³⁶ Reuters. “After G8, Blair puts ball in Africa’s court”. July 11, 2005.

NGO AND CIVIL SOCIETY RESPONSES

Make Poverty History

Following the release of the Gleneagles communiqué, the Make Poverty History campaign released its own statement. First, the MPH statement denounced that the G8 had “chosen not to do all that campaigners insist is necessary to free people trapped in poverty”. The statement then went on to say that, although important steps have been taken, “more action is urgently needed”, and urged all world leaders to push for further change at the upcoming UN summit on the Millennium Development Goals and the World Trade Organisation trade talks.²³⁷

On trade, the MPH claimed that the G8 have “not met the challenge of trade justice as clearly set out by Make Poverty History” and called for further action on letting African countries set their own trade policies and on the scrapping of export subsidies and agricultural dumping practices.

On debt, the MPH claimed that the G8 had “done no more than confirm the proposed deal by the G8 Finance Ministers, cancelling some of the debt owed by some countries.” The statement goes on to say that, despite being an important contribution, the debt deal will provide less than \$1 billion this year - the equivalent of no more than one dollar per person in the countries that are due to benefit. MPH considered this an “inadequate” response to what was called for and urged an additional \$10 billion a year of debt cancellation in order to eradicate extreme poverty. Conditionality of debt relief was also attacked, as well as the fact that many countries were not covered by the deal.

On aid, the MPH stated that the communiqué was a “step forward” but still “far from the historic deal that millions around the world have been demanding”. Congratulating itself for playing a part in securing the aid increase, MPH then claimed that the five year wait before aid arrives is too long and the amounts too little. MPH also condemned the restatement of recent aid announcements, claiming that, of the \$48 billion pledged, only \$20 billion is actually new money. For the future, MPH called for the G8 to reduce aid conditionality and improve the quality of aid given.

On HIV/AIDS, MPH credited the G8 with producing “one of the summit’s successes” and praised leaders for “responding courageously to the scale of the AIDS emergency.” However, the statement goes on to say that without adequate aid flows into the future, universal treatment of those living with HIV/AIDS by 2010 will not be possible. It also adds that the action comes too late to save many.

On climate change, the MPH claimed that the G8 “has missed the opportunity to make progress” and stated that it will look to the UK’s presidency of the EU for further action on the issue.

²³⁷ For further information, please see Appendix D.

Bono / Geldof

Some of the few purely positive reactions to the communiqué came from the celebrities of the Live 8 concerts. Both Bono and Bob Geldof were reported to have praised the summit, almost unconditionally. Upon seeing the final communiqué, Geldof stated his satisfaction with the deal, claiming “Mission accomplished, frankly”.²³⁸ He also added that “never before have so many people forced a change of policy onto a global agenda... If anyone had said eight weeks ago will we get a doubling of aid, will we get a deal on debt, people would have said ‘no’.”²³⁹

Slightly less satisfied, Bono acknowledged that the deal was “not everything we’ve been looking for”, but like Geldof, he was hesitant to criticise the outcomes.²⁴⁰ In fact, when some NGOs approached Geldof to make a more restrained statement about the outcomes and call the G8 leaders on failing to meet the demands of the campaign, Geldof refused to change his stance, maintaining that this was “the most important summit there had ever been for Africa” and giving the deal “10 out of 10” on aid, and “eight out of 10” on debt.²⁴¹

For this reason, many groups condemned the duo, claiming they only served as “hype merchants” for the G8 leaders.²⁴² Peter Hardstaff, World Development Movement, argued: “Bob Geldof’s response to the G8 communiqué is misleading and inaccurate. By offering such unwarranted praise for the dismal deal signed by world leaders he has done a disservice to the hundreds of thousands of people who marched in Edinburgh at the weekend.” Hardstaff also clarified that Geldof’s praise of the summit does “not reflect the collective conclusions of the development campaigns who make up Make Poverty History”. Hardstaff attributed Geldof’s unwarranted praise to the fact that he was “too close to the decision-makers to take an objective view of what has been achieved at this summit.”²⁴³

John Hilary, War on Want, echoed this view. “Bob Geldof may be content with crumbs from the table of his rich political friends, but we did not come to Gleneagles as beggars. We came to demand justice for the world’s poor...We have no problem with Geldof celebrating the successes of the Gleneagles summit and the 10 million lives he feels will be saved as a result of this deal. But what about the other two billion people driven into poverty by the policies of the G8? Did the leaders of the rich have nothing for them?”²⁴⁴

Hilary then went on to criticise the deal in detail, complaining that the G8 have given less than 10 percent of our demand on debt cancellation and even a fifth of what we called for on aid. On trade, the G8 has hardened its stance, forcing more countries to open their markets and threatening millions with the misery of poverty. When the moment came to act, the G8 turned

²³⁸ The Observer. “Geldof delighted at G8 action on aid”. July 10, 2005.

²³⁹ BBC. “African head defends G8 agreement”. July 9, 2005.

²⁴⁰ BBC. “Mixed reaction over Blair G8 deal”. July 8, 2005.

²⁴¹ BBC. “Half full or half empty?” July 8, 2005; BBC. “Mixed reaction over Blair G8 deal”. July 8, 2005.

²⁴² Corporate Watch. “Corporate Watch at the G8”. July 13, 2005.

²⁴³ Inter-Press Service. “Pop campaign on Africa fizzles out”. July 9, 2005.

²⁴⁴ Inter-Press Service. “Pop campaign on Africa fizzles out”. July 9, 2005.

their backs on the world's poor"²⁴⁵ In another instance, Hilary referred to the deal as "paltry", calling it an "insult to poor people the world over".²⁴⁶

Despite its alleged 'close ties' to the UK government and the G8, Oxfam also criticised Geldof and his evaluation of the outcomes of the summit. Max Lawson, Oxfam Policy Advisor claimed that there was "an incentive on the part of Number 10 Downing Street and even Bob Geldof to portray these announcements as a huge deal" and stated that Oxfam would be "very concerned if people came away with the impression that this was the case".²⁴⁷

Oxfam then went on to outline new demands. In light of the deal agreed, Oxfam called for the increase in aid by \$50 billion extra annually to start immediately, not in 2010, as this could lift an extra 500 million people out of poverty. It also urged G8 leaders to expand the debt deal to the more than sixty countries that need it in order to fight poverty. Also, Oxfam appealed to developed countries go further on trade issues, in particular, the scrapping of harmful export subsidies paid to their farmers and allowing poor countries decide their own trade policies.²⁴⁸

In a joint statement, Friends of the Earth, War on Want, and World Development Movement also outlined their concerns with the deal. In particular, they voiced concern over the UK's role in "leading an aggressive 'free trade' agenda at the WTO"; the UK's role in pushing for the privatisation of public services in developing countries; the UK's failure to take action on reducing emissions despite claiming international leadership on the issue; and the UK's continued opposition to the regulation of companies through frameworks of corporate accountability like the UN 'Norms on the responsibilities of transnational corporations'. The groups feared that, unless the UK were to change its approach, these factors would undermine any of the positive aspects of the deal made in Gleneagles.²⁴⁹

On Aid

For many groups, the main concern with the aid deal made in Gleneagles was that the promises would not be kept. Citing past experiences, NGOs and civil society groups claimed that too many pledges to increase aid have never been fulfilled, so there was little reason to be excited over another 'new pledge'.

Other groups stated that they were concerned about the quality of aid that was pledged, pointing to conditionalities including the privatisation of services and the purchase of foreign goods.²⁵⁰ In addition to an ActionAid representative's complaint that less than half of the money pledged by the G8 leaders was actually new money, he also blasted the fact that most money ends up back in the developed world. As his Mozambican colleague explained, "They can give us financial aid,

²⁴⁵ Reuters AlertNet. "Reaction to G8 deal on Africa". July 8, 2005.

²⁴⁶ War on Want. "G8: Massive shortfall exposed in Gleneagles deal". July 5, 2005.

²⁴⁷ Financial Times. "NGOs grow weary of world leaders' 'empty' initiatives". July 5, 2005.

²⁴⁸ Oxfam International. "G8 leaders 'must lead', not rubber stamp the work of their deputies". July 7, 2005.

²⁴⁹ Friends of the Earth, War on Want, World Development Movement. "2005 and Sustainable Development: why the UK government is part of the problem". July 8, 2005.

²⁵⁰ BBC. "G8: Will it meet expectations?". July 4, 2005.

but what happens is that the same money goes back to them...They send their people to work with us and pay them big salaries. And we are paid low salaries.”²⁵¹

Some also pointed out that increases in aid do not necessarily address the problems of aid effectiveness as it does not fix institutional weaknesses, conditionality, or trade distortions like barriers to imports and subsidies.²⁵² As ActionAid spokesperson Caroline Sande-Mukulira said, “What is on offer now is \$50 billion in five years time. This is 55 million children too late...Moreover, less than half is new money. And if you check the small print, it still comes with damaging strings attached.”²⁵³

Jo Leadbeater, a member of Oxfam International, echoed the concerns about the timing of the aid. “The G8’s aid increase could save the lives of 5 million children by 2010—but 50 million children’s lives will still be lost because the G8 didn’t go as far as they should have gone. If the \$50 billion increase had kicked in immediately, it could have lifted 300 million people out of poverty in the next five years”.²⁵⁴

However, for Simon Maxwell, Director of the Overseas Development Institute, the problem stems from the failure to agree on finance mechanisms. “The biggest disappointment [of Gleneagles],” he claimed, “was the failure to reach agreement on new forms of finance, especially Gordon Brown’s idea of an international financing facility.”²⁵⁵

Meanwhile, Corporate Watch criticised the G8 for “unconditionally embracing the private sector as the main potential economic saviour for Africa, with no mention of the many disastrous consequences of corporate involvement in areas of Africa.”²⁵⁶ In a report published specially for the summit entitled ‘Bringing the G8 home’, Corporate Watch described the high level of corporate involvement in and around the G8 in Scotland, claiming that this has influenced the official outcomes.²⁵⁷ In particular, Corporate Watch explained that it was concerned that the aid being given to build infrastructure in Africa would end up going to the private sector. Based on statements from Haiko Alfeld, director of Africa at the World Economic Forum that “business has an enormous interest if \$25 billion is to flow into Africa” and that this would “unleash enormous potential and business opportunities”, Corporate Watch feared that the aid deal could translate into private sector profits—mainly multinational companies—at the expense of socially responsible local business.²⁵⁸

On Trade

In response to the Gleneagles trade deal, many NGOs and civil society organisations claimed that the communiqué demonstrated little leadership and made little progress. According to

²⁵¹ Fairfax New Zealand. “Poor unimpressed by G8 action”. July 11, 2005.

²⁵² Toronto Star. “There are many ways to increase the effectiveness of the aid we give”. July 6, 2005.

²⁵³ Reuters. “Blair determined blasts will not stop summit deals”. July 7, 2005.

²⁵⁴ Reuters AlertNet. “He said, she said: Aid experts dissect G8 result”. July 20, 2005.

²⁵⁵ The Guardian. “It’s not the Marshall Plan, but it’s a start.” July 11, 2005.

²⁵⁶ Corporate Watch. “Corporate Watch at the G8”. July 13, 2005.

²⁵⁷ Corporate Watch. “Corporate Involvement in and around the G8 in Scotland in 2005”. May 25, 2005.

²⁵⁸ Red Pepper. “Our corporate interest”. July 2005.

Consumers International, the communiqué consisted of merely re-stating prior commitments made within the Doha negotiations. Also, the group claimed, the G8 failed to offer the political leadership necessary to make progress in the current Doha negotiations. With the Hong Kong Ministerial meeting less than six months away, CI worried that the G8 statement was a “missed opportunity”.²⁵⁹

Officials at the World Trade Organization in Geneva Saturday also worried that the G8 had overstated its progress on trade. After reading the Gleneagles communiqué, some trade negotiators described a “bizarre disconnect” between the enthusiastic rhetoric from the G8 leaders and intransigence from negotiators that has brought the Doha round almost to a halt. However, they also noted that the G8 declaration would have little effect on the trade negotiations as it merely restates what has already been promised in the Doha Round.²⁶⁰

For some groups, the lack of progress on trade justice, one of the key demands of the Make Poverty History campaign, was particularly frustrating. World Development Movement felt that the entire issue had been “sidelined”, while aid and debt relief stole the stage.²⁶¹ Other groups worried that the concept of “trade justice” had been misinterpreted by the G8 to mean more trade, rather than more equitable trade.

Part of the campaign for trade justice also involved a plea for the end to subsidies. However, according to many groups, this was also ignored. A statement from Business Unity South Africa (BUSA) explained frustration that the communiqué only outlined an end to subsidies by a “credible end date”. The group argued that, in order to make progress at the next WTO Ministerial, the G8 countries would have to show more leadership than they had shown in Gleneagles.²⁶²

Zambian Deputy Finance Minister Felix Mutati lamented the weakness of the trade agreement. He pleaded for the G8 leaders to consider the plight of African farmers and move toward trade justice. “What we need most is fair trade,” he claimed, “because our farmers cannot compete with farmers in the West...The whole issue of trade hinges on farm subsidies and the quicker this is resolved the better.”²⁶³ However, Claire Melamed, a representative of Christian Aid, called for the leaders to clarify what kind of trade they seek. Given the importance of the issue of trade, Melamed claimed it was time for leaders to “decode” their wording on trade. “When they speak of an ambitious Doha round of trade negotiations, we think they mean lots of liberalisation, and when they speak of balance here, we think they mean they want everyone to liberalise, including poor countries”.²⁶⁴

²⁵⁹ Consumers International. “The G8 summit and Africa—two steps forward, one step back”. July 2005.

²⁶⁰ Financial Times. Title of Article Unknown. July 9, 2005; Noticias. “G8 mood and Doha talks show ‘disconnect’”. July 12, 2005.

²⁶¹ World Development Movement. “G8: Trade issues being sidelined”. July 7, 2005.

²⁶² Business Unity South Africa. “G8 must do more for trade”. July 11, 2005.

²⁶³ BBC. “Africa head defends G8 agreement”. July 9, 2005.

²⁶⁴ Inter-Press Service. “Africa is offered a little—at a price”. July 8, 2005.

ActionAid spokesperson Adriano Campolina Soares went further in his criticism, accusing the G8 of “completely failing to deliver trade justice.” According to Soares, Bush and the EU have “played a cynical game of bluff”, all the while knowing that the USA has no intention of giving up or lowering the subsidies it gives its cotton farmers. As a result, he argued, poor countries should take this as a warning that they will have a hard fight in the upcoming trade talks at the WTO.²⁶⁵

For Sue Mbaya from the Southern Africa Regional Poverty Network, the “lack of breakthrough on trade issues is a sign we are likely to see more of that dithering in the future”. However, she also warned developed countries that if the Southern Africa did not see a significant shift in agricultural subsidies, it would have little to talk about in the WTO negotiations.²⁶⁶

Vandana Shiva (Director of the Research Foundation for Science, Technology, and Ecology) and Caroline Lucas (Green MEP) expressed their concerns that the G8 trade deal would undermine the other progress made in Gleneagles in other areas. In their joint Inter-Press Service article, they claimed that there was a “glaring contradiction between [the MPH’s] demands and the G8’s interpretation of ‘trade justice’”. Shiva maintained that, as long as the summit serves “primarily as a vehicle for pushing ahead the free trade project”, any agreements on other issues must be carefully approached. Although the “G8 countries will doubtless drop a few more crumbs of aid to their poorer neighbours, and may even keep their pledges to cancel some of the debt, the effects of this apparent largesse will be swallowed up many times over by the negative impact on poor countries of being forced to open their markets to international competition.” Rather than making poverty history, the two writers claimed, the G8 with its focus on trade is more likely to make poverty inevitable.²⁶⁷

Other groups, likewise suspicious of the trade agreement, called for caution in assessing the communiqué. As London School of Economics Economist Robert Hunter-Wade pointed out, there is a danger in the simplistic message: “liberalise trade”. According to Hunter-Wade, even World Bank findings point to minimal gains for developing countries from trade liberalisation. With less than one percent of GDP to be gained and concentration of this gain in less than a dozen developing countries, Hunter-Wade warned that many countries could actually lose.²⁶⁸

Echoing this warning, Wayne Roberts of the Toronto Food Policy Council stated that merely increasing or liberalising trade is not the answer. Citing the experience of small-scale Canadian farmers, National Farmers Union Research Director Darrin Qualman, explained how merely increasing Canada’s export trade has had drastic impacts. Although Canadian agriculture has “succeeded brilliantly” in increasing exports, he claimed, this has resulted in the “worst farm income crisis in Canadian history since the 1930s Depression”. While food prices remained flat, inflation rose, and new money flowed to farm supply companies and bankers, rather than staying in the pockets of the producers, Qualman explained. Warning that African chocolate, cotton, and coffee producers could face the same scenario unless the right trade protection measures were

²⁶⁵ Ekklesia News. “G8 outcome disappoints poverty and ecology lobbies”. July 9, 2005.

²⁶⁶ Reuters. “Africans wary G8 will not deliver aid pledges”. July 13, 2005.

²⁶⁷ Inter-Press Service. “G8’s free trade project is here to stay—along with world poverty”. July 4, 2005.

²⁶⁸ Financial Times. “Why free trade has costs for developing countries”. August 11, 2005.

used, Qualman suggested that it would be more helpful to give African farmers the “right to build [trade] barriers, not tear them down”.²⁶⁹

On Debt

For many of the groups campaigning for debt relief, the agreement negotiated prior to the Gleneagles summit was seen as “too little, too late”. Although debt campaigners were pleased that some action had been taken, many felt it was inadequate, noting that the deal only forgave a fraction of the total stock of debt owed by poor countries estimated at more than \$520 billion.²⁷⁰ As Walden Bello, Focus on the Global South, stated, “When the leaders talk of wiping out \$25 billion of debt, remember they found \$30 billion for the Iraq war at the drop of a hat”.²⁷¹

Kumi Naidoo, Chair of GCAP and CIVICUS, also called the agreement a “small, belated step in the right direction”, but criticised the deal for only including 18 countries, ignoring the more than 60 other countries affected by debt. Naidoo also pointed to the \$30 billion dollars of debt forgiven in Iraq and the \$300 billion price tag of the US-led war and occupation of Iraq as evidence that the G8 could have afforded greater debt relief and for more countries, if they had wanted.²⁷² Commenting on the timing of the debt relief, Naidoo claimed that “the promise to deliver by 2010 is like waiting five years before responding to the tsunami.”²⁷³

In their response to the G8 debt deal, the Jubilee Campaign declared that it should be “welcomed as the first step on the road towards writing off the debt burdens that prevent developing countries from attaining their Millennium Development Goals.” However, the group also claimed it was “a wholly inadequate response to the demands made by NGOs and civil society debt campaigners for a total cancellation of unsustainable debt”. The group also called for reforms to international finance and trade, given that debt cancellation only serves to address the symptoms of chronic poverty and not solve the underlying problems.²⁷⁴ Jubilee USA voiced its concerns that the deal did not include all countries and all debt to creditors, such as the Inter-American Development Bank. The group further criticised G8 leaders for applying “onerous conditionalities” to debt relief.²⁷⁵

Many NGOs were also outraged when celebrity debt-campaigner Bono announced, after reading the G8 communiqué, “The debt stuff, we are there on that”. World Development Movement, in particular, condemned Bono’s “misleading impression that the debt problem has been solved”, pointing out that only 18 countries qualified for debt relief when more than 60 require debt relief in order to achieve the MDGs and that the amount of money on offer only addresses roughly 10 percent of the problem.²⁷⁶ Many also expressed their fears that certain countries, like Nigeria—Africa’s largest country and biggest debtor, would not be included. However, some fears were

²⁶⁹ NOW Toronto. “Bono hears boos: rocker’s plan for fairer trade could make Africa’s poverty worse.” June 30, 2005.

²⁷⁰ Christian Science Monitor. “The G8’s bottom line on helping poor nations”. July 7, 2005.

²⁷¹ The Guardian. “200 000 form Edinburgh human chain.” July 2, 2005.

²⁷² Inter-Press Service. “Poverty campaign throws a final challenge”. July 6, 2005.

²⁷³ BBC. “G8 leaders agree \$50 billion aid boost”. July 8, 2005; Reuters. “Reaction to G8 deal on Africa”. July 8, 2005.

²⁷⁴ AlterNet. “Measuring victory”. July 26, 2005.

²⁷⁵ For further information, please visit: www.jubileeusa.org

²⁷⁶ World Development Movement. “The debt stuff, we are not there on that”. July 6, 2005.

allayed when, in the week before the summit, Gordon Brown negotiated a debt cancellation deal that involved the biggest single debt write-off in African history and announced that nine more deals were in the pipeline.²⁷⁷

Despite these announcements, however, War on Want claimed that there was still much left for G8 to do. Based on the communiqué, War on Want estimated that the proposed deal would provide less than five percent of the debt relief required, less than 20 percent of the aid needed to meet the MPH objectives, and worried that the G8's "hardened stance on trade...could further undermine the agreement".²⁷⁸ Many groups, in fact, worried that, in order to qualify for debt relief, these countries have been forced to meet 'harmful economic conditions under the HIPC process', including 'sweeping programmes of trade liberalisation and privatisation.' Some feared that these programmes will, rather than decrease poverty, only serve to increase it.

Like other groups, War on Want also criticised the deal for failing to announce anything new. According to John Hilary, Director of Campaigns and Policy, much of what was announced had already been pledged. "We are not getting any sense that anything new will be done", he claimed. "At the most, there could be a little extra here or there on particular deals."

Debt campaigners were also very critical of the 'strings' attached to the G8 debt relief deal. George Monbiot pointed to the paragraph of the Finance Ministers' agreement that called for developing countries to tackle corruption, boost private sector development, attract investment, and remove "impediments to private investment, both domestic and foreign", and concluded that the conditionality applied to debt relief is "as onerous as the debt it relieves."²⁷⁹ Others worried that, in order to meet the conditions outlined for debt relief, poor countries would have to rely on new loans to get the process started. Some also feared that debt forgiveness for some countries would mean less money available for others in the future. Others still were concerned that debt relief would lead to irresponsible borrowing in the future, while punishing those responsible borrowers from the past.²⁸⁰

On the other hand, Global Exchange spokesperson Kevin Danaher worried that debt relief was being seen as a solution to all problems. Rather, he explained, debt relief can sometimes spell relief for elites alone in developing countries, without requiring any serious reforms. "There is nothing to guarantee that [the elites] will use the money freed up by debt relief to instead fund social services for the poor, and there is nothing to guarantee that they won't simply get their countries into debt all over again...In fact, being relieved from the pressure of debt payments could allow many third world elites to better resist local pressure for democratic change," he claimed.²⁸¹

²⁷⁷ The Guardian. "200 000 form Edinburgh human chain." July 2, 2005; BBC. "G8: Will it meet expectations?". July 4, 2005.

²⁷⁸ Inter-Press Service. "NGOs see clouds over Gleneagles". July 5, 2005.

²⁷⁹ BBC. "The downside of the G8 debt deal". July 8, 2005.

²⁸⁰ China Daily. "Developing nations' role at G8". July 5, 2005; BBC. "G8: Will it meet expectations?". July 4, 2005.

²⁸¹ Global Exchange listserve. "An alternative to the debt crisis." No date given.

In certain instances, claimed some groups, debt relief can even create its own set of problems. In an article in the *Christian Science Monitor*, Mark Rice-Oxley explained how, with the cancellation of debt owed to the IMF and the World Bank, these lending bodies will be starved of capital to make future loans.²⁸² Some also feared that debt relief will simply be subtracted from existing aid packages, making the situation worse than before.²⁸³ For Julius Okara of the Kenya Debt Relief Network, the debt relief offered by the G8 seemed more problematic than it was worth. “It’s not debt relief at all. It’s simply enslaving Africans more”, he claimed, commenting on the difficulty of implementing the reforms necessary to qualify for the debt relief. Given the costliness of such reforms, “My conclusion is that I do not want this debt relief to be implemented”, he said.

Following the G8, there were also rumblings that the debt deal was under attack from the inside. In the weeks after the summit, there were growing fears that the agreement to offer 100 percent debt cancellation to 18 countries was unravelling as reports came in that a number of European governments were attempting to change the terms outlined in the Gleneagles communiqué. A leaked report suggested that as many as 30 EU governments were ‘not happy’ with the agreement for various reasons.²⁸⁴ A document leaked to the Jubilee Debt Campaign stated that Belgian official Willy Kierkens, backed by Austria and Luxembourg, was quoted as telling the IMF executive board that “rather than giving full, irrevocable and unconditional debt relief...countries would receive grants”. As a consequence, the IMF would then be able to withdraw the grants if countries failed to meet the ‘good governance’ requirements set out by the IMF. Supposedly, representatives of Holland, Switzerland, and several of the Baltic countries also requested additional conditionalities be attached to the deal.²⁸⁵

In an angry response to the leaked documents, the Jubilee Debt Campaign stated: “These proposals are in direct contradiction to what millions of campaigners and poor people were told by the G8”. Although Jubilee stated it was not certain whether small countries could derail the deal, given that it takes 15 percent of the votes on the IMF to block a deal, the group was unimpressed with attempts to back out of the agreement. Martin Powell from World Development Movement issued a similar response. “The G8 controls the IMF, and nothing can pass there without their support. If this proposal goes ahead the G8 will be responsible for the greatest political betrayal in the history of their meetings. The one redeeming feature of an otherwise woefully inadequate debt deal will have been lost.”²⁸⁶

On Climate Change

For the majority of the civil society groups and NGOs in Gleneagles, the deal on climate change was essentially seen as worthless. Reflecting the US intransigence on Kyoto, the agreement failed to outline any specific pledges to cut emissions. Although the lack of action was not surprising to many groups, they were disappointed and concerned that the weakness of the climate change deal could undermine any attempts to make progress on achieving the MDGs in

²⁸² *Christian Science Monitor*. “The G8’s bottom line on helping poor nations”. July 7, 2005.

²⁸³ *Mail & Guardian Zambia*. “G8 slammed the door in Africa’s face”. July 14, 2005.

²⁸⁴ *The Epoch Times Australia*. “G8 Africa debt relief plan in jeopardy”. July 18, 2005.

²⁸⁵ *The Epoch Times Australia*. “G8 Africa debt relief plan in jeopardy”. July 18, 2005.

²⁸⁶ *BBC*. “G8 debt deal under threat at IMF”. July 15, 2005; *The Guardian*. “European countries see to dilute G8 debt relief deal”. July 16, 2005.

Africa. As Lord May of Oxford, President of the UK's Academy of Science worded it, "In its communiqué, the G8 talks of 'facing a moment of opportunity', while, at the same time, it is turning away from that moment".²⁸⁷

Echoing this disappointment, Friends of the Earth Chair Meena Raman exclaimed: "To be honest, we don't have much hope with the G8...the G8 is about powerful governments who are backed by industry." Although she acknowledged that Blair made some small steps in the right direction, she expressed concern that the US was still not on board. As a result, she explained, Friends of the Earth now feels that any attempt to tackle climate change needs to start with the big corporations, including American corporations. There is, Raman claimed, an urgent need to create binding legislation governing corporate behaviour and ensuring accountability, not just voluntary standards that permit companies to 'greenwash'.²⁸⁸

The Union of Concerned Scientists, an American group, also denounced Bush's "stubborn and irresponsible" stance in Gleneagles. Comparing his inaction to California governor Arnold Schwarzenegger's "bold initiative last month to cut heat trapping pollution by 80 percent by 2050", the Union called for similar leadership from Bush. "It is also time for the president to stop repeating the deceit that reducing global warming pollution will wreck the American economy, when the growing market for more energy efficient buildings, appliances, and vehicles, renewable energy production, and biomass and biofuels feedstock is already proving to be profitable for US companies."²⁸⁹

Other groups, such as the Sustainable Energy and Economy Network (SEEN), expressed concern over the role and influence of the World Bank in the climate change agreement at Gleneagles. In a petition organised by SEEN, 120 civil society groups criticised the G8 action plan for entrusting the World Bank with the role of providing financing for clean energy. The letter stated: "The World Bank is one of the leading public financiers of fossil fuels and has made a minuscule commitment to renewable energy, contrary to statements by the Bank."²⁹⁰

Despite the frustrations of many groups with the communiqué, some acknowledged that 'limited progress' was made. Although Stephen Tindale, Executive Director of Greenpeace, argued that the cost of the agreement was too high, particularly for those living in poor areas most vulnerable to climate change, he also noted that he was pleased that dialogue—although no substitute for action— is now taking place.²⁹¹ Even Chirac, though pleased with the "shift in American position", expressed disappointment that the agreement did not go "as far as we would have wanted."²⁹²

The International Energy Agency, an energy 'watchdog' and arm of the OECD, stated that it too was pleased with the agreement on the "reality" of global warming and the acknowledgement

²⁸⁷ BBC. "G8 calls for new climate dialogue." July 8, 2005.

²⁸⁸ Inter-Press Service. "Greenwashing does not make the world cleaner". July 3, 2005.

²⁸⁹ The Guardian. "America feels the heat". July 14, 2005.

²⁹⁰ Red Pepper. "Make the G8 History blog: how campaigners responded to the G8 communique". July 10, 2005.

²⁹¹ Greenpeace. "Dialogue no replacement for action on climate change". July 8, 2005.

²⁹² BBC. "G8 prepares climate change statement". July 7, 2005.

that humanity was at least partly responsible and that the situation was urgent. The group stated its intentions to continue pushing for further improvements to energy efficiency, more international coordination on policies on labelling and standards, and the development of cleaner vehicles.²⁹³

Some environmental groups also seemed pleased with the stance taken by developing countries on the issue of climate change. In a joint statement, India, Brazil, South Africa, Mexico, and China called for industrialised countries to take the lead in “international action to combat climate change by fully implementing their obligations of reducing emissions and of providing additional financing and the transfer of cleaner, low-emission and cost-effective technologies to developing countries.” In response, Tony Juniper of Friends of the Earth, remarked: “The big developing countries have shown that there is only one world leader in Gleneagles this week who thinks that the Kyoto Protocol is the wrong way forward, and that is President Bush”.²⁹⁴

On the other hand, some groups were actually satisfied with the G8’s inaction on climate change. Carbon Trade Watch, for instance, was concerned that, if the G8 were to act on climate change, it would likely have endorsed “inappropriate solutions” such as nuclear energy or the funding of ‘carbon sinks’ in developing countries. In place of lowering their own emissions, the group explained, wealthy countries would pay for plantations to counter-act their environmental damage. The result, they feared, would be that the carbon credit approach “may trigger a new wave of debt mechanism and inequity on the south”—the more carbon a person or company in a Northern country emits, the more land it will be entitled to grab in the South for its carbon emissions. The problem, therefore, is that this approach would take land away from indigenous peoples and, as Heidi Bachram, one of the group’s spokespersons explained, “act as an occupying force in impoverished rural communities dependent on these lands for survival.” According to Carbon Trade Watch, the real solution to climate change lies in “de-carbonising the global economy.”²⁹⁵

Regarding the future of climate change negotiations, many groups seem to be holding out for the UN climate change conference. The conference, scheduled for later this year, will bring energy, environment, and development ministers together in Montreal in November. Full negotiations on the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change are set to begin in December. Many of the groups are eager to hear what is planned for post-2012, when the Kyoto protocol expires, and how countries plan to make the necessary emissions reductions that are needed to prevent climate change from spiralling out of control.²⁹⁶

On HIV/AIDS

The G8’s agreement on HIV/AIDS was met with mixed reviews. Bono praised the agreement on access to AIDS drugs, claiming that “600 000 Africans, mostly children would remember this G8 summit because they will be around to remember this summit, and they wouldn’t have

²⁹³ Reuters. “G8 energy plan a good starting point—IEA”. July 11, 2005.

²⁹⁴ Inter-Press Service. “Developing countries stand firm by Kyoto Protocol”. July 7, 2005.

²⁹⁵ Red Pepper. “G8 climate change: don’t hold your breath”. July 2005.

²⁹⁶ The Guardian. “America feels the heat”. July 14, 2005.

otherwise.”²⁹⁷ Lee Jong-Wook, Director General of the World Health Organisation, also praised the deal, calling it an “unprecedented commitment to health which has the potential to forever change the lives of millions of people in Africa”.²⁹⁸

More cautious praise came from the International Stop AIDS Campaign. The group stated that its satisfaction with the agreement was tempered by the fact that the aid and debt agreements fell short of campaigners’ expectations and their fear that leaders would back-peddle on their promises. For what it was worth, however, the group acknowledged that the deal was a “great achievement” for its members, stating that it planned to “celebrate this as well as continue to grapple with the difficulties of getting focus on HIV within wider development work.”²⁹⁹

Similarly, the UK Stop AIDS Campaign feared that the progress made at Gleneagles could too easily be lost if the leaders failed to keep their pledges. “The first test of the G8’s commitment will be the Global Fund replenishment conference in London at the beginning of September. Few of the G8 countries have paid their fair share to the Global Fund so far. The G8’s plan for universal treatment will bring hope to millions. What remains to be seen is whether those hopes will be dashed by insufficient funding”.³⁰⁰

Simon Wright, a member of the Campaign, added that he was concerned that the aid was “not sufficient or fast enough” and that trade rules needed to be changed so that countries could buy and produce cheaper drugs.³⁰¹

Other groups questioned the deal on other grounds. Tom Arnold, CEO of Concern, expressed doubt that the deal could be implemented. Arguing that the infrastructure to deliver the universal treatment outlined in the Gleneagles deal is not in yet in place and anti-retroviral treatments are not even reaching three million at present, Arnold questioned whether it will be possible to reach an estimated thirty million by 2010.³⁰²

UN Special Envoy for HIV/AIDS in Africa Stephen Lewis attacked the deal for providing far too little funding to effectively meet its objectives. According to UNAIDS estimates, a minimum of \$22 billion will be required annually, from 2008 onward. Given that the G8 aid deal only allocates another \$25 billion to address all of the Millennium Development Goals, Lewis called the deal “inadequate” and “paltry”. From his perspective, the amount will barely address the one goal of defeating communicable diseases. “Unless the G8 can do a lot better than the present calculus,” Lewis argued, “Gleneagles will be much like all the G7 or G8 summits before it: a rhetorical triumph, a pragmatic illusion.”³⁰³

²⁹⁷ BBC. “G8 leaders agree \$50 billion aid boost”. July 8, 2005.

²⁹⁸ British Medical Journal. “WHO welcomes G8’s commitment on AIDS, but campaign group says it is not enough”. July 16, 2005.

²⁹⁹ Stop AIDS Campaign. “Weblog.” July 8, 2005.

³⁰⁰ British Medical Journal. “WHO welcomes G8’s commitment on AIDS, but campaign group says it is not enough”. July 16, 2005.

³⁰¹ Reuters AlertNet. “He said, she said: aid experts dissect G8 deal”. July 20, 2005.

³⁰² Reuters AlertNet. “He said, she said: aid experts dissect G8 deal”. July 20, 2005.

³⁰³ AllAfrica.com. “G8 summit must go beyond rhetorical triumph—UN envoy”. July 1, 2005.

On Africa

In response to the G8 agreements on Africa, some NGOs felt that the leaders had taken important first steps, while others criticised them for failing to meet campaigners' expectations. Regarding African health care, Physicians for Human Rights said it was pleased that the G8 had endorsed, for the first time, the idea that Western countries have a responsibility to Africa. In particular, it supported the idea of responsibility to invest in African health systems, to train doctors, nurses, and community health workers, and to help build capacity in order to assist African nations meet the MDGs. However, Physicians for Human Rights also claimed that the deal fell short in that it failed to outline a plan to alleviate the current health care crisis or specify a sum of money which must be committed to the problem.³⁰⁴

CARE USA commended the G8 deal for providing a comprehensive solution to some of Africa's most pressing problem. According to Susan Farnsworth, the new commitments will help to strengthen Africa economically, increase agricultural production, and provide health and educational opportunities. Thanks to the G8 deal, she claimed, "we will advance toward our goal of reducing extreme poverty". And, when combined with the recent agreement on debt relief and the promise of trade reform, Farnsworth called the deal a "significant step forward in the fight to end extreme poverty, hunger, and disease".³⁰⁵

Some organisations, however, were more doubtful. Dumisani Mnisi, from Save the Children Swaziland, commented, "People are a bit jaded in terms of these promises. We need to see it become concrete. It is just an announcement but we don't know what it will translate into in real concrete terms."³⁰⁶ "As optimistic as we would like to be, we should be wary based on their track record, which has often been far short compared to the pledges," voiced Sue Mbaya of the Southern Africa Regional Poverty Network.³⁰⁷

Likewise, Njeri Kinyoho of GCAP Africa called the deal a "welcome decision", but warned that it should also be treated with caution. "As long as that \$50 billion plus whatever else they are going to release will come with conditions, then obviously it will be undermining the very campaign we're trying to champion. We're saying we want aid that is not tied to any kind of conditionalities, particularly economic policy conditions where they ask us to further liberalise and open up our markets."³⁰⁸

Other groups were concerned that, with Africa headlining this year's summit, future summits will focus on other areas and consider Africa a "done deal". According to John Stremlau of the University of the Witwatersrand, these fears are well-founded. "Attention is going to move on to India and China; it has already".³⁰⁹

³⁰⁴ Physicians for Human Rights. "G8 statement affirms responsibility to address Africa's health worker crisis". July 8, 2005.

³⁰⁵ Reuters AlertNet. "He said, she said: aid experts dissect G8 result". July 20, 2005.

³⁰⁶ Reuters AlertNet. "Reaction to G8 deal on Africa". July 8, 2005.

³⁰⁷ Reuters. "Africans wary G8 will not deliver aid pledges". July 13, 2005.

³⁰⁸ Reuters AlertNet. "Reaction to G8 deal on Africa". July 8, 2005.

³⁰⁹ Business Report Zambia. "Africa disappointed with the G8's crumbs". July 11, 2005.

And, although most organisations supported the focus of this year's summit on Africa, there was some concern that other areas were being neglected as a result. "There area about 500 million people living in absolute poverty in Asia...This is not to deny the need to help Africa. Africa is the only region in the world where poverty has been growing for the last 15 years," claimed John Samuels of ActionAid. "With the focus on Africa, poverty in Asia, particularly South Asia, is being pushed under the carpet," he added.³¹⁰ Other groups attributed the oversight of non-African countries to the exclusively African focus of the Live 8.

Caribbean-based organisations, in particular, claimed that they felt left out. Concerned about how climate change will affect them, the groups were particularly distressed by the G8's suggestion that "low-lying coastal zones and small island states" should, in essence, learn to "adapt to the effects of climate change"...³¹¹

In a highly critical statement, various African civil society groups joined forces to condemn the G8 deal on Africa. In their joint declaration, the group blasted the leaders for failing to take bold actions, instead promising more "empty words".³¹²

Caroline Sande-Mukulira of ActionAid Southern Africa deemed the outcome "another disappointing result for Africa." Despite campaigners' expectations and the strong demands of the AU leaders from their summit in Libya, Sande-Mukulira pointed out that "none of these were met".³¹³ Charles Abugre of Christian Aid UK agreed. "World leaders have failed to exploit this opportunity. This debt deal is nowhere near what the AU demands, namely that all of Africa should see a universal, unconditional, and unselective removal of debt."³¹⁴ Putting his disappointment in simple terms, CAFOD Head of Policy George Gelber said, "The G8s promise to provide the resources to halve extreme poverty by 2015 has not been kept."³¹⁵

In much harsher terms, Peter Hardstaff of World Development Movement decried the deal. According to Hardstaff: "The final communiqué is an insult to the hundreds of thousands of campaigners who listened in good faith to the world leaders' claim that they were willing to seriously address poverty in Africa. More importantly, it is a disaster for the world's poor. The agreements on trade, debt, aid, and climate change are nowhere near sufficient to tackle the global poverty and environmental crisis we face..."³¹⁶ As a result, he argued, Africa is now condemned to miss the MDGs. Given the "tiny sums of money", no meaningful action on climate change, no significant commitment to alter trade rules, too little aid too late, and the re-announcement of debt already cancelled, Hardstaff concluded that the G8 leaders failed Africa.

In spite of his anger, Hardstaff, like many others, stated that they were not surprised at the outcome. "Calling on the G8 to Make Poverty History this year was always a brave attempt to put

³¹⁰ Inter-Press Service. "Don't forget Asia". July 8, 2005.

³¹¹ The Jamaica Observer. "Nothing for the Caribbean from G8 meeting". July 17, 2005.

³¹² For further information, please see Appendix E; Oneworld.net. "G8 deal falls short of expectations, say many environmental and aid groups". July 9, 2005.

³¹³ Reuters AlertNet. "Reaction to G8 deal on Africa". July 8, 2005.

³¹⁴ Christian Aid. "Blair is right—G8 result is 'disappointment'". July 11, 2005.

³¹⁵ Times Online. "Blair backs G8's 'big progress' on poverty and AIDS". July 8, 2005.

³¹⁶ Times Online. "Blair backs G8's 'big progress' on poverty and AIDS". July 8, 2005; World Development Movement. "G8 condemn Africa to miss Millennium Development Goals". July 8, 2005.

aside 30 years of knowledge of G8 failures and suspend our disbelief at the notion that the countries responsible for causing so much poverty could become the solution.”³¹⁷

CONCLUDING THOUGHTS

As the summit drew to an anti-climactic close, NGOs and civil society organisations were left to evaluate the outcomes of the summit and prepare themselves for the next battle. In an effort to recapture some of the pre-summit energy before the next event, Kumi Naidoo (GCAP, CIVICUS) urged campaigners to remember: “What’s important about this G8 summit is that it helped focus the attention of ordinary citizens across the world, helped to get them involved and to voice their concerns about poverty and their compassion for the poor. That is something we need to capitalise on now. We need to recognise that what minimal progress that has been made at the G8 was the result of ordinary people. Our message to citizens around the world is, ‘Do not lose heart. We have won some small victories here. They are not insignificant in terms of the numbers of lives involved in Africa if [the G8 pledges] are implemented quickly and effectively. But the struggle is not a sprint, it is a marathon, and now we must focus our attention on the Millennium Development Goal summit in September and the WTO meeting in December’”.³¹⁸

From an equally optimistic/realistic perspective, Rebecca Solnit urged others to recognise “less-than-perfect, less-than-complete achievements.” Otherwise, she warned, there is a danger of never acknowledging that our actions do have impacts and effects.³¹⁹

Professor John Kirton, Director of the University of Toronto G8 Research Group, also called for recognition of civil society’s achievements. According to Kirton, a key part of the summit has been the “unprecedented opportunity it offered for civil society to take part in the central deliberations”. Kirton also pointed to ‘sherpa’ meetings with civil society representatives and the provision of media space to NGOs and other groups as evidence of a changing dynamic. “The Make Poverty History campaign and Live 8 campaigns played the most important role so far of any G8 summit in showing how civil society can exert real pressure and influence the agenda and outcome”, he added. As a result, he claimed, it will be more difficult to exclude the participation of civil society, as well as developing countries, from future summits.³²⁰

Returning home, many groups reflected that, despite not achieving everything, the heightened sense of urgency and the public’s attention to the issues had been a boost for the movement. What remains to be seen, however, is how long that momentum can be sustained.

³¹⁷ World Development Movement. “G8 condemn Africa to miss Millennium Development Goals.” July 8, 2005.

³¹⁸ Christian Aid video interview. July 7, 2005.

³¹⁹ AlterNet. “Measuring victory”. July 26, 2005.

³²⁰ BBC. “Can G8 be considered a success?” July 8, 2005.

DIRECTIONS FOR THE FUTURE

For many, sights are set on the UN Millennium Summit, scheduled to take place in New York in September. With much of its agenda focused on the MDGs and the presence of all UN members and the media, most groups feel this is the next most appropriate time to push for action on poverty.

Following that, preparations are underway for a strong showing of civil society at the World Trade Organisation Ministerial in Hong Kong. Given the collapse of the trade talks two years ago in Cancun, and the lack of progress since, some organisations feel that their presence at this crucial point in time could influence the outcome.

The next G8 summit will take place in St. Petersburg, Russia in 2006. It is anticipated that the summit will focus on energy security and the stability of energy supplies.

PHOTO GALLERY



Banners at the Edinburgh Protests



"Make Poverty History" banner on Edinburgh Castle



Frustrated Protesters Prevented from Boarding Buses to Gleneagles



Dissent! Network's Edinburgh Information Centre



"Geldof the Great"



Police Surveillance of Protesters



MPH Street Art in Edinburgh



CIRCA Clowns at March on Gleneagles



Security at Gleneagles



Robin Hood and Maid Marian Confront the Riot Police



Hop on Board the “MPH” Bus



The Colourful Gates to the Stirling Eco-village



Welcome to Stirling Eco-village / Info-point



The Eco-village Barrios



Anarchist Campers in Stirling Eco-village



CIRCA's "Solar/Chip-Fat Fuelled" Headquarters



Rebel Golfers Prepare for Gleneagles



“Boogie on the Bridge”, Glasgow



Climate Change Protesters at the "Boogie", Glasgow



Anti-Climate Change Clown Army, Glasgow



McClowns



Protesters against the M74 Extension

ANNEXES

APPENDIX A GLOBAL DECLARATION OF COMMON SECURITY

known as the Alternative G8 Edinburgh Declaration of Common Security)
July 14, 2005³²¹

AWARE THAT solutions have never resided in the fragmentation of issues and if real global change is to occur this change will be found in a willingness to address the complexity and interdependence of issues in particular the linking of militarism, poverty, violation of human rights, and destruction of the environment.

Recognizing that true security- is not "collective security" or "human security" which has been extended to "humanitarian intervention" and used along with the "responsibility to protect" notion to justify military intervention in other states. True security is common security (extension of Olaf Palme's notion of "common security") and involves the following objectives:

* to promote and fully guarantee respect for human rights including labour rights, civil and political rights, social and cultural rights- right to food, right to housing, right to universally accessible not for profit health care system , right to education and social justice;

* to enable socially equitable and environmentally sound employment, and ensure the right to development [as per Convention];

* to achieve a state of peace, social justice and disarmament; through reallocation of military expenses, and eradication of poverty

* to create a global structure that respects the rule of law ; and

* to ensure the preservation and protection of the environment, respect the inherent worth of nature beyond human purpose, reduce the ecological footprint and move away from the current model of over-consumptive development.

CONSIDERING THAT for years, through conventions, treaties and covenants, through Conference Action plans, and through UN General Assembly resolutions, member states of the United Nations have incurred obligations, made commitments and created expectations related to the furtherance of Common Security.

AFFIRMING THAT Common security can only be achieved if there is a concerted international effort to eliminate(d) the complexity and interdependence of the actions that have led to global insecurity

WE THE X COUNTRIES HAVE AGREED TO THE FOLLOWING:

Article 1

We reaffirm our commitment to multilateralism and oppose unilateral actions that undermine global common security.

Article 2

We undertake to reduce our military budgets and reallocate military expenses and transfer the savings

³²¹ This Declaration was prepared to counter the official G8 Edinburgh Declaration, and was circulated for signatures during the G8 Summit in Edinburgh. Citizens from a wide range of professions, groups, countries signed on to the Declaration. The Declaration with the initial list of signatories was sent to G8 leaders from Canada, England, Germany, Japan, Germany, Russia, US. There was considerable international support, and for that reason, the Declaration has been renamed and resent to be distributed prior to and on the 60th Anniversary of the United Nations on October 24, 2005. Since 1997, various versions of this declaration have been distributed with input since that time. It was circulated as Citizens Charter for State and Corporate Compliance to counter the MAI, then subsequently updated to counter APEC (1997); WTO (1999); FTAA (2001); G8 in Kananaskis. It was also circulated as the Citizen's Public Trust Treaty and presented at Peace conference in the Hague, and at a meeting at the International Court of Justice.

into global social justice as undertaken through numerous UN Conference Action Plans and UN General Assembly Resolutions.

Article 3

We will no longer undermine the notion of democracy by couching a plutocracy/theocracy in democratic notions of "freedom".

Article 4

We will abandon the policy of pre-emptive/preventive attack to aggressively attack sovereign states which has been a violation of the UN Charter article 2 and international law and is the 'supreme' international crime of a war of aggression.

Article 5

We will no longer perceive justice in terms of revenge through military intervention we will instead seek justice through the International Court of Justice.

Article 6

We will no longer misconstrue Art 51 (self defence) of the Charter of the United Nations to justify premeditated non provoked military aggression.

Article 7

We will oppose any attempt to undermine the international resolve to prevent the scourge of war; this would include not engaging in intimidation or in offering economic incentives in exchange for support for military intervention.

Article 8

We undertake to respect the mandatory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice, and will abide by its decisions.

Article 9

We will convert to peaceful purposes military bases in sovereign states around the world, and end the circulation of nuclear powered or nuclear arms capable vessels throughout the world.

Article 10

We will discontinue propping up and financing military dictators.

Article 12

We will abandon the practice of targeting or assisting in the assassination of leaders of other sovereign states, and engaging in covert destabilization or democratically elected leaders of or any leader of a sovereign state.

Article 12

We will abide by the Nuclear Non Proliferation treaty and immediately implement Article VI of the treaty, (Article VI: commits all parties to pursue negotiations in good faith on measures to end the nuclear arms race and to achieve disarmament.) and we will end the production of all weapons of mass destruction such as nuclear, chemical, and biological, as agreed to in UNCHE in 1972, and in specific conventions.

Article 13

We reaffirm the obligations under the 1967 the Outer space Treaty to ensure that exploration and use of outer space, including the moon and other celestial bodies, shall be carried out for the benefit and in the interests of all countries, irrespective of their degree of economic or scientific development, and shall be the province of all mankind humanity.

Article 14

We make a full commitment to disarmament and oppose the continued profit making from the sale of arms, will implement obligations to reduce the trade in small arms and in collaboration with the ILO will fund a fair and just transition program for worker currently working in the arms trade.

Article 15

We will end the production of land mines and sign and ratify the Convention for the Banning of Landmines, and affirm a commitment of funds and continuous effort to remove land mines from all areas of the world where they are known to exist.

Article 16

We will suffocate the production of uranium, phase out the use of civil nuclear energy, and prohibit the use of weapons such as Depleted Uranium and cluster bombs that would be prohibited under the Geneva Protocol II.

Article 17

We oppose NATO'S first strike policy, and support the disbanding of NATO.

Article 18

We will abide by the Geneva conventions on the treatment of civilians, and respect international human rights and humanitarian law.

Article 19

We will discharge obligations incurred through conventions, treaties, and covenants; and act on commitments through conference action plans related to Common security - peace, environment, human rights and social justice.

Article 20

We will sign, ratify, and enact the necessary legislation to ensure compliance with, or respect for Common Security international Conventions, Covenants and Treaties.

Article 21

We will abide by the Convention against Torture through Cruel, Inhumane or Degrading Treatment or Punishment, and end the practice of rendition of citizens and will abide by the Geneva conventions.

Article 22

We will eliminate cruel and inhumane punishment such as capital punishment, which violates accepted international norms.

Article 23

We will abandon institutions and agreements which promulgate globalization, deregulation and privatization; these institutions and agreements undermine the rule of international public trust law, and condone and actively facilitate corporations benefiting and profiting from war.

Article 24

We oppose the promulgation, globalization, deregulation and privatization through trade agreements, such as the WTO/FTAA/NAFTA, etc. that undermine the rule of international public trust law.

Article 25

We abandon the IMF structural adjustment program which has led to the violation of human rights, has exploited citizens in the developing world and has adversely impacted on vulnerable and indigenous peoples around the world.

Article 26

We oppose the privatization of public services such as water and health care, we will increase funding to Universities to counter the corporate funding of education including the corporate direction of research and declare that these be the responsibility of governments.

Article 27

We will finally implement the long standing international commitment to transfer .7% of the GDP for overseas aid, and to cancel third world debt.

Article 28

We will no longer subsidize and invest in companies that have developed weapons of mass destruction, that have violated human rights, that have denied social justice, that have exploited workers, and that have destroyed the environment.

Article 29

We will implement the commitment made to ensure that corporations, including transnational corporations comply with international law, and that they pay compensation for any previous health and environmental consequences of their actions.

Article 30

We will revoke charters and licences of corporations that have violated human rights, including labour rights, that have contributed to war and violence, and that have led to the destruction of the environment.

Article 31

We support Mandatory International Ethical Normative (MIEN) standards and enforceable regulations to drive industry to conform to international law, and oppose corporate "voluntary compliance".

Article 32

We will ban practices that contribute to environmentally induced diseases and we will address poverty related health problems and ensure universal access, to publicly funded not for profit health care system.

Article 33

We will end the production of toxic, hazardous, atomic waste, and we will prevent the transfer to other states of substances and activities that are harmful to human health or the environment as agreed at the UN Conferences on the Environment and Development, 1992.

Article 34

We will ban the production, approval and promotion of genetically engineered foods and crops which have led to a deterioration of the food supply, and to loss of heritage seeds.

Article 35

We will protect Biodiversity by signing and ratifying the Convention on Biological Diversity and oppose "megadiversity" resulting from genetic engineering.

Article 36

We will be forthright in acknowledging that the Biosafety Protocol is a disguised trade agreement, and serves to promote the acceptance of genetically modified living organisms.

Article 37

We will accept the warnings of the Intergovernmental panel on Climate Change, and no longer disregard obligations under the Framework Convention on Climate Change and its protocol to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, and to preserve carbon sinks. We will oppose any suggestion that civil nuclear energy is the solution to climate change.

Article 38

We will rescind anti-terrorism legislation because it violates civil and political rights, and results in racial profiling.

Article 39

We will no longer target, intimidate and discriminate against activists on the grounds of political and other opinion (a listed ground in the International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights).

Article 40

We will clearly distinguish legitimate dissent from criminal acts of subversion.

Article 41

We will end all discrimination on the following grounds:

- race, tribe, or culture;
- colour, ethnicity, national ethnic or social origin, or language; nationality, place of birth,

or nature of residence (refugee or immigrant, migrant worker);
-gender, sex, sexual orientation, gender identity, marital status, or form of family,
[including same-sex marriage]
-disability or age;
-religion or conviction, political or other opinion, or
-class, economic position, or other status.

Article 42

We will end the discrimination against immigrants, and refugees and we sign and ratify the Convention for the Protection of Migrant Workers and their Families; and the Convention on Refugees.

Article 43

We will respect women's reproductive rights, and abide by commitments made under the International Conference on Population and Development, and the Beijing Platform.

Article 44

We oppose religious extremism and proselytizing including the spread of Evangelical Christianity around the world, which has undermined local indigenous cultures, instilled fear through the dangerous, belief in the "rapture", "Armageddon" and "left behind", has promulgated dispensationalist "end times" scenario which has serious irreversible consequences and has led to the denigrating other established beliefs and practices.

Article 45

We support the institution of an International Court of Compliance linked to the International Court of Justice; The Court of Compliance will hear evidence from citizens of state non compliance.

Proposed by the Global Compliance Research Project

OPEN FOR SIGNATURES FROM CIVIL SOCIETY

This Declaration is for governments to act, and for civil society to urge their governments to act. Please add name of your country and send the Declaration to the leader of your country with a copy to Joan Russow, j.russow@shawlink.ca. The Declaration will also be sent to all leaders and media, at different times leading up to the October 24, 2005, 60th Anniversary of the United Nations.

APPENDIX B MAKEPOVERTYHISTORY

JUSTICE. DROP THE DEBT. MORE & BETTER AID.

Today, the gap between the world's rich and poor is wider than ever. Global injustices such as poverty, AIDS, malnutrition, conflict and illiteracy remain rife.

Despite the promises of world leaders, at our present sluggish rate of progress the world will fail dismally to reach internationally agreed targets to halve global poverty by 2015.

World poverty is sustained not by chance or nature, but by a combination of factors: injustice in global trade; the huge burden of debt; insufficient and ineffective aid. Each of these is exacerbated by inappropriate economic policies imposed by rich countries.

But it doesn't have to be this way. These factors are determined by human decisions.

2005 offers an exceptional series of opportunities for the UK to take a lead internationally, to start turning things around. Next year, as the UK hosts the annual G8 gathering of powerful world leaders and heads up the European Union (EU), the UK Government will be a particularly influential player on the world stage.

A sea change is needed. By mobilising popular support across a unique string of events and actions, we will press our own government to compel rich countries to fulfil their obligations and promises to help eradicate poverty, and to rethink some long-held assumptions.

MAKEPOVERTYHISTORY urges the government and international decision makers to rise to the challenge of 2005. We are calling for urgent and meaningful policy change on three critical and inextricably linked areas: **trade**, **debt** and **aid**.

4. Trade justice

- **Fight for rules that ensure governments, particularly in poor countries, can choose the best solutions to end poverty and protect the environment. These will not always be free trade policies.**
- **End export subsidies that damage the livelihoods of poor rural communities around the world.**
- **Make laws that stop big business profiting at the expense of people and the environment.**

The rules of international trade are stacked in favour of the most powerful countries and their businesses. On the one hand these rules allow rich countries to pay their farmers and companies subsidies to export food – destroying the livelihoods of poor farmers. On the other, poverty eradication, human rights and environmental protection come a poor second to the goal of 'eliminating trade barriers'.

We need trade justice **not** free trade. This means the EU single-handedly putting an end to its damaging agricultural export subsidies **now**; it means ensuring poor countries can feed their people by protecting their own farmers and staple crops; it means ensuring governments can effectively regulate water companies by keeping water out of world trade rules; and it means ensuring trade rules do not undermine core labour standards.

We need to stop the World Bank and International Monetary Fund (IMF) forcing poor countries to open their markets to trade with rich countries, which has proved so disastrous over the past 20 years; the EU must drop its demand that former European colonies open their markets and give more rights to big companies; we need to regulate companies – making them accountable for their social and

environmental impact both here and abroad; and we must ensure that countries are able to regulate foreign investment in a way that best suits their own needs.

2. Drop the debt

- **The unpayable debts of the world's poorest countries should be cancelled in full, by fair and transparent means.**

Despite grand statements from world leaders, the debt crisis is far from over. Rich countries have not delivered on the promise they made more than six years ago to cancel unpayable poor country debts. As a result, many countries still have to spend more on debt repayments than on meeting the needs of their people.

Rich countries and the institutions they control must act **now** to cancel all the unpayable debts of the poorest countries. They should not do this by depriving poor countries of new aid, but by digging into their pockets and providing **new** money.

The task of calculating how much debt should be cancelled must no longer be left to creditors concerned mainly with minimising their own costs. Instead, we need a fair and transparent international process to make sure that human needs take priority over debt repayments.

International institutions like the IMF and World Bank must stop asking poor countries to jump through hoops in order to qualify for debt relief. Poor countries should no longer have to privatise basic services or liberalise economies as a condition for getting the debt relief they so desperately need.

And to avoid another debt crisis hard on the heels of the first, poor countries need to be given more grants, rather than seeing their debt burden piled even higher with yet more loans.

3. More and better aid

- **Donors must now deliver at least \$50 billion more in aid and set a binding timetable for spending 0.7% of national income on aid. Aid must also be made to work more effectively for poor people.**

Poverty will not be eradicated without an immediate and major increase in international aid. Rich countries have promised to provide the extra money needed to meet internationally agreed poverty reduction targets. This amounts to at least \$50 billion per year, according to official estimates, and must be delivered now.

Rich countries have also promised to provide 0.7% of their national income in aid and they must now make good on their commitment by setting a binding timetable to reach this target.

However, without far-reaching changes in how aid is delivered, it won't achieve maximum benefits. Two key areas of reform are needed.

First, aid needs to focus better on poor people's needs. This means more aid being spent on areas such as basic healthcare and education. Aid should no longer be tied to goods and services from the donor, so ensuring that more money is spent in the poorest countries. And the World Bank and the IMF must become fully democratic in order for poor people's concerns to be heard.

Second, aid should support poor countries and communities' own plans and paths out of poverty. Aid should therefore no longer be conditional on recipients promising economic change like privatising or deregulating their services, cutting health and education spending, or opening up their markets: these are unfair practices that have never been proven to reduce poverty. And aid needs to be made predictable, so that poor countries can plan effectively and take control of their own budgets in the fight against poverty.

MAKEPOVERTYHISTORY is a unique UK alliance of charities, trade unions, campaigning groups and celebrities who are mobilising around key opportunities in 2005 to drive forward the struggle against poverty and injustice.

www.MAKEPOVERTYHISTORY.org

APPENDIX C CHAIR'S SUMMARY, GLENEAGLES SUMMIT, 8 JULY

We met at Gleneagles for our annual Summit, 6-8 July 2005.

Terrorist Attacks on London

All the world leaders who gathered at Gleneagles yesterday and today condemned the barbaric attacks on London and offered our profound condolences to the victims and their families. We came to Gleneagles to work to combat poverty and save and improve lives. We have not allowed violence to disrupt the work of this Summit. The terrorists have not and will not succeed. As well as our work on poverty and climate change, we resolved to intensify our work on counter terrorism.

Climate Change

We were joined for our discussion on climate change and the global economy by the leaders of Brazil, China, India, Mexico, and South Africa and by the heads of the International Energy Agency, International Monetary Fund, United Nations, World Bank, and the World Trade Organisation.

We have issued a statement setting out our common purpose in tackling climate change, promoting clean energy and achieving sustainable development.

All of us agreed that climate change is happening now, that human activity is contributing to it, and that it could affect every part of the globe.

We know that, globally, emissions must slow, peak and then decline, moving us towards a low-carbon economy. This will require leadership from the developed world.

We resolved to take urgent action to meet the challenges we face. The Gleneagles Plan of Action which we have agreed demonstrates our commitment. We will take measures to develop markets for clean energy technologies, to increase their availability in developing countries, and to help vulnerable communities adapt to the impact of climate change.

We warmly welcomed the involvement of the leaders of the emerging economy countries in our discussions, and their ideas for new approaches to international co-operation on clean energy technologies between the developed and developing world.

Our discussions mark the beginning of a new Dialogue between the G8 nations and other countries with significant energy needs, consistent with the aims and principles of the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change. This will explore how best to exchange technology, reduce emissions, and meet our energy needs in a sustainable way, as we implement and build on the Plan of Action.

We will advance the global effort to tackle climate change at the UN Climate Change Conference in Montreal later this year. Those of us who have ratified the Kyoto Protocol remain committed to it, and will continue to work to make it a success.

Africa and Development

We were joined for our discussion on Africa and development by the leaders of Algeria, Ethiopia, Ghana, Nigeria, Senegal, South Africa and Tanzania and by the heads of the African Union Commission, International Monetary Fund, United Nations and the World Bank.

We discussed how to accelerate progress towards the Millennium Goals, especially in Africa which has the furthest to go to achieve these goals by 2015.

We welcomed the substantial progress Africa has made in recent years. More countries have held democratic elections. Economic growth is accelerating. Long running conflicts are being brought to an end.

We agreed that we and our African partners had a common interest in building on that progress to create a strong, peaceful and prosperous Africa; we share a strong moral conviction that this should be done, and have agreed the actions that we will take.

The African leaders set out their personal commitment, reaffirmed strongly at this week's African Union summit, to drive forward plans to reduce poverty and promote economic growth; deepen transparency and good governance; strengthen democratic institutions and processes; show zero tolerance for corruption; remove all obstacles to intra-African trade; and bring about lasting peace and security across the continent.

The G8 in return agreed a comprehensive plan to support Africa's progress. This is set out in our separate statement today. We agreed:

- to provide extra resources for Africa's peacekeeping forces so that they can better deter, prevent and resolve conflicts in Africa
- to give enhanced support for greater democracy, effective governance and transparency, and to help fight corruption and return stolen assets
- to boost investment in health and education, and to take action to combat HIV/AIDS, malaria, TB and other killer diseases
- to stimulate growth, to improve the investment climate and to make trade work for Africa, including by helping to build Africa's capacity to trade and working to mobilise the extra investment in infrastructure which is needed for business

The G8 leaders agreed to back this plan with substantial extra resources for countries which have strong national development plans and are committed to good governance, democracy and transparency. We agreed that poor countries must decide and lead their own development strategies and economic policies.

We have agreed to double aid for Africa by 2010. Aid for all developing countries will increase, according to the OECD, by around \$50bn per year by 2010, of which at least \$25bn extra per year for Africa. A group of G8 and other countries will also take forward innovative financing mechanisms including the IFF for immunisation, an air-ticket solidarity levy and the IFF to deliver and bring forward the financing, and a working group will consider the implementation of these mechanisms. We agreed that the World Bank should have a leading role in supporting the partnership between the G8, other donors and Africa, helping to ensure that additional assistance is effectively co-ordinated.

The G8 has also agreed that all of the debts owed by eligible heavily indebted poor countries to IDA, the International Monetary Fund and the African Development Fund should be cancelled, as set out in our Finance Ministers agreement on 11 June. We also welcomed the Paris Club decision to write off around \$17 billion of Nigeria's debt.

The G8 and African leaders agreed that if implemented these measures and the others set out in our comprehensive plan could:

- double the size of Africa's economy and trade by 2015
- deliver increased domestic and foreign investment
- lift tens of millions of people out of poverty every year
- save millions of lives a year
- get all children into primary school
- deliver free basic health care and primary education for all
- provide as close as possible to universal access to treatment for AIDS by 2010
- generate employment and other opportunities for young people
- bring about an end to conflict in Africa.

In order to ensure delivery, we agreed to strengthen the African Partners Forum and that it should establish a Joint Action Plan.

But we know this is only the beginning. We must build on the progress we have made today. We must take this spirit forward to the UN Millennium Review Summit in New York in September, and ensure a successful conclusion to the Doha Development Agenda.

Global Economy, Oil and Trade

We discussed the outlook for global economic growth, which we expect to remain robust. We recognised that maintaining this growth is a challenge, and reaffirmed that each of our countries must play its part to support long-term sustainable growth. Higher and more volatile oil prices are an issue of particular concern both to us and to vulnerable developing countries. We emphasise the need for concrete actions to reduce market volatility through more comprehensive transparent and timely data.

We agreed to redouble our efforts to achieve a successful conclusion across the whole of the Doha Development Agenda. We saw this as vital to drive growth and boost incomes across the world, and a necessary element of our work to reduce global poverty. We and our emerging economy partners agreed to inject the necessary political momentum into the discussion to ensure an outline agreement by the WTO Hong Kong Ministerial in December, and a final agreement in 2006.

We reaffirmed our commitment to open markets more widely to trade in agricultural goods, industrial goods and services, and in agriculture to reduce trade distorting domestic subsidies and eliminate all forms of export subsidies by a credible end date. We also committed to address products of interest to Least Developed Countries in the negotiations, and to ensure Least Developed Countries have the flexibility to decide their own economic strategies.

We issued statements on the global economy and oil, trade, and on action to reduce Intellectual Property Right piracy and counterfeiting.

Regional Issues and Proliferation

We met James Wolfensohn, the Quartet's Special Envoy for Disengagement, who briefed on his work to help ensure a successful Israeli disengagement from Gaza and parts of the West Bank, and his proposals for long-term follow-up to that process, laying the foundations for the viability of a future Palestinian state. We welcomed and strongly endorsed his efforts, and will explore how best to support his proposals for the future.

We reconfirmed our commitment to the Partnership for Progress and a Common Future with the Region of the Broader Middle East and North Africa, based on genuine co-operation between the G8 and the governments, business and civil society of the region. We welcomed steps taken in the region to accelerate political, economic, social and educational reform and stressed our support for the emerging momentum in the region for change. We look forward to the Forum for the Future in Bahrain in November 2005 as an opportunity to further advance the work of the partnership.

Six months on from the enormous tragedy of the Indian Ocean disaster on 26 December 2004, we have underlined our support for UN work on post-tsunami humanitarian aid and reconstruction, as well as confirming our commitment to reduce the risk from future disasters and to encourage reform of the humanitarian system.

We reaffirmed that the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and their delivery systems, together with international terrorism, remain the pre-eminent threats to international peace and security. We reaffirmed our commitments and called on all States to uphold in full international norms on non-proliferation and to meet their arms control and disarmament obligations. We emphasised our determination to meet proliferation challenges decisively, through both national and multilateral efforts. We expressed particular concern about the threat of proliferation in North Korea and Iran.

On Iran we support the efforts of France, Germany and the UK, with the EU, to address through negotiation the concerns about Iran's nuclear programme, and expressed once again the importance of Iran combating terrorism, supporting peace in the Middle East and respecting human rights and fundamental freedoms.

On North Korea, we support the Six Party Talks and urged North Korea to return promptly to them. We call on North Korea to abandon its nuclear weapons-related programmes. Action is also long overdue for North Korea to respond to the international community's concern over its human rights record and the abductions issue.

We discussed the situations in Sudan and in Iraq and issued separate statements setting out our common approach. We also issued statements on the Middle East Peace Process, the Broader Middle East and North Africa Initiative, the Indian Ocean disaster, and counter-proliferation, and a progress report on the Secure and Facilitated Travel Initiative (SAFTI). In addition, we discussed:

- Afghanistan, where we reaffirmed our commitment to support the Government and people of Afghanistan as they tackle their long term challenges of reconstruction, security, counter-narcotics, and restoring the rule of law, and welcomed the forthcoming Parliamentary and Provincial elections
- Lebanon, where we welcomed the recent elections and looked forward to the early formation of a new Lebanese Government made up of respected members of society, who support reform, and are committed to protecting the sovereignty of their country. We reiterated that UN Security Council Resolution 1559 must be applied in its entirety
- Zimbabwe, where we deplored recent events. The forced demolition of buildings there has left hundreds of thousands of Zimbabweans without housing or livelihoods, and caused great human suffering. We call on the Zimbabwean authorities to end this campaign now, address immediately the situation they have created, and respect human rights and the rule of law

We welcome the visit of the UN Secretary-General's Special Envoy. We look forward to her report on the situation. We will continue to support the UN and other international organisations in their efforts to provide food and humanitarian assistance to all those in need in Zimbabwe

- Haiti, where we expressed concern at the deteriorating security situation. We underlined the need for sustained international engagement, including through the active efforts of the UN Stabilisation Mission in Haiti, in support of a secure and stable environment, essential for elections later in 2005, and for the country's long-term development
- UN Reform, where we agreed that the progress made at Gleneagles should contribute to a clear and ambitious outcome at the UN Millennium Review Summit in September. We reiterate the importance we attach to significant progress on development, security and human rights, and also on UN administrative reform, at the Summit.

We welcomed the offer of the President of the Russian Federation to host our next Summit in 2006.

APPENDIX D MAKE POVERTY HISTORY RESPONSE TO G8 COMMUNIQUE³²²

Make Poverty History has become an unprecedented movement of passion, energy and solidarity. Never before have so many people in the world come together, fully united in demanding action to end poverty, with a roar for justice that they felt was impossible to ignore.

Today the G8 have chosen not to do all that campaigners insist is necessary to free people trapped in the prison of poverty. Important steps have been taken - steps that will bring hope to millions.

But more action is urgently needed if they are to play their role in bringing about real change for the world's poorest people and consigning extreme poverty to the history books.

To secure a deserved place in history, the G8 must go a lot further and secure real change by working with other world leaders at the UN summit on the Millennium Development Goals and talks around the World Trade Organisation. The people of the world are already on the road to justice.

They expect their leaders to be with them. Today's announcement has shown that the G8 need to run much faster to catch up.

TRADE

The G8 have not met the challenge of trade justice as clearly set out by Make Poverty History. There is language in the communiqué on letting African countries set their own trade policies. Yet at the World Trade Organisation (WTO) they continue to force open developing country markets. What we have asked for is action not words.

G8 leaders decided not to set a date for ending the export subsidies that destroy livelihoods of poor countries around the world. By forcing free trade on poor countries, dumping agricultural products and not regulating multinational companies they have chosen not to take the necessary decisions to make poverty history.

The challenge of trade justice remains. The governments of the G8 must now urgently take these steps at the WTO and in other trade negotiations as well as through the World Bank and International Monetary Fund. Rich countries are the obstacles to trade justice. This must stop if trade is to benefit the poor rather than keep them in poverty.

DEBT

The G8 has done no more than confirm the proposed deal by the G8 Finance Ministers, cancelling some of the debt owed by some countries. The principle of cancelling 100 per cent of the debt owed to multilateral institutions is a positive step, and a tribute to the unceasing efforts of Make Poverty History campaigners and campaigners worldwide; but this debt deal is a small step compared to the giant leap that was called for.

While an important contribution, the G8 debt deal will provide less than \$1 billion this year - the equivalent of no more than one dollar per person in the countries that are due to benefit. It is an inadequate response to the global debt crisis, which needs an estimated \$10 billion a year of debt cancellation to eradicate extreme poverty.

Major issues on debt remain unresolved - the damaging economic policy conditions attached to debt relief, the many indebted countries not on the list, debts not covered by the deal.

So there is much more work to be done - the deal is yet to be ratified and then it needs to be delivered. Our campaigners expect more and will be continuing to seek significant improvements and advances during the rest of the year.

³²² www.makepovertyhistory.org/response

AID

While this aid increase is a step forward, it is far from the historic deal that millions around the world have been demanding.

There is no doubt that this aid increase will save lives and Make Poverty History campaigners can be really proud of the role they have played in securing it. But this aid will still arrive five years too late and falls far short of the scale of aid that is needed to end poverty in the world's poorest countries. In real terms, much of the pledged funds are a restatement of recent aid announcements.

For most of the 50 million children who will die of poverty over the next five years, the G8 leaders have offered too little, too late. By 2010, we will still see the awful inequity whereby a child dies every 3.5 seconds, just because they are poor.

The G8's promise of US\$48 billion boost to aid in five years is mostly made up of money already pledged. MPH calculates that only around US\$20 billion is new money. Some of this money is also likely to be raised through borrowing from future aid budgets, rather than new contributions.

Make Poverty History welcomes the G8's recognition that poor countries should be free to decide their own economic policies. These words must now be turned into actions by putting an end to the damaging conditions that the World Bank and IMF push on impoverished countries.

If the G8 are really serious about reducing poverty, they should be doing much more to improve the quality of their aid, including untying aid from donors' goods and services and ensuring that aid is focused on the poorest. On both areas, they have offered warm words, but little in terms of concrete commitments.

HIV/AIDS

G8 leaders have produced one of the summit's successes by responding courageously to the scale of the AIDS emergency. In pledging AIDS treatment to everyone who requires it by 2010, the G8 have started to restore hope to the 40 million people currently living- and dying- with HIV.

However, insufficient new aid will undermine the target's delivery. The additional aid announced today is not sufficient or fast enough to truly make AIDS history.

Positive people will now be looking to donors to deliver full AIDS funding at the Global Fund Replenishment conference this September. Without adequate financing, this bold and visionary target could become another of the broken promises that litter the history of the pandemic.

UK GOVERNMENT

In the last 20 years the G8 has repeatedly failed to take the action it could to eradicate poverty. This has been an unprecedented year in which millions of people have campaigned to make poverty history and the UK government have responded by placing Africa on the agenda as a priority for the G8.

They have worked hard with European Union and G8 colleagues to deliver significant steps towards debt cancellation and more and better aid. Throughout this summit, the UK government have demonstrated leadership on these vital issues.

The G8 choosing not to deliver all that campaigners feel is necessary will disappoint the millions of campaigners in the UK but we will judge the UK government by its contribution to the delivery of all our campaign demands for trade justice not free trade, more and better aid and debt cancellation for all developing countries.

CLIMATE CHANGE

The G8 has missed the opportunity to make progress on climate change, the impacts of which are already affecting poor countries and will seriously undermine efforts to eliminate poverty in the long term. We now look to the UK's Presidency of the EU for effective action to rectify this lack of progress.

APPENDIX E Joint Statement from African Civil Society Organisations at the Conclusion of the 2005 Summit, Gleneagles, Scotland July 6-8th

the G8 Summit comes to an end on the 8th July, we representatives of some of the largest continental organisations and national networks headquartered in several African cities, bringing together women's organisations, labour, researchers, development and advocacy NGOs across Africa note the following;

Firstly, we express our total solidarity with the British people and our deep sorrow for the victims of the terrorist attacks on London yesterday.

Simply put, we are disappointed in the outcomes of Gleneagles. The resolutions fall far short of our expectations for a comprehensive and radical strategy to make poverty history in Africa. The Summit has simply reaffirmed existing decisions on debt cancellation and doubling of aid. The debt package only provides only 10% of the relief required and affects only one third of the countries that need it. A large component of the US\$50 billion pledged is drawn from existing obligations. Further, both packages are still attached to harmful policy conditionality. "Today, the G8 missed a historic opportunity to write off the debt of over 62 least developing countries," said Hassen Lorgat of South Africa's SAN-GOCO.

Our work has just begun. Over the next six months, we shall intensify our campaigns for;

- 1) Total and unconditional debt write-off for all of Africa failing which debt repudiation becomes the logical conclusion for African Governments.
- 2) The G8 to meet the 0.7% GNI target for international development assistance and front load those commitments without donor imposed policy conditionality.
- 3) The WTO to recognise the right of African states to redress and protect their fragile economies without losing their right to access industrialized countries markets
- 4) Remove OECD market access constraints and end subsidies that lead to dumping of products on Africa markets, crowding out African farmers and producers.

Above all, Africa must look within for change. "The message from Gleneagles is clear to us in Africa. We will intensify our call to our Governments that have not secured debt cancellation to strongly consider repudiating their unjust and odious external debt," said Justice Ekwere of Civil Society Action Coalition on Education for All in Nigeria. The HIPC conditionalities do not suit the needs of most of our countries. Further, we urge them to exercise their right to protect our economies and essential services like health and education.

This year, we have been an integral part of a historic global campaign to end poverty. We will continue to mobilize internationally through the Global Call to Action Against Poverty and other global campaigns. The millions mobilized in Africa and around the world should not be disappointed. We will stay our course and remain vigilant until we secure the conditions for Africa's renaissance.

Signed by the following African and regional civil society organizations and networks:

African Network on Debt and Development (AFRODAD) – Harare
 African Women Development and Communication Network (FEMNET) –Nairobi
 Mwelekeo wa NGO (MWENGO) – Harare
 Southern and Eastern African Trade Information and Negotiations Institute (SEATINI)
 Pan African Literacy and Adult Education (PALAE)
 Africa Network Campaign on Education for All (ANCEFA)
 South African National NGO Coalition (SANGOCO) - South Africa
 Le Conseil des ONG du Sénégal (CONGAD)
 Eco-news Africa – Kenya
 Civil Society Action Coalition on Education for All - Nigeria