

Trade justice

Turning words into action

A campaign guide



christian
aid

We believe in life before death



This guide maps out the campaign route to trade justice.

Our first step is to **expose the myth** that forcing liberalisation on poor countries will help them out of poverty.

Then we must compel the most powerful decision-makers to **turn the rhetoric into policy change**.

And finally, we must consolidate our efforts as part of a **global campaign** to ensure a real difference is made to the lives of the world's poorest people.

The basics

Trade justice, free trade and liberalisation explained

Why this campaign matters

What we're calling for

PAGE
04

Exposing the myth

Free trade and liberalisation

Market access and subsidies

Big business

Corruption

PAGE
06

Turning rhetoric into policy change

The International Monetary Fund and World Bank

The World Trade Organisation

Regional trade agreements

PAGE
14

A global campaign

What's been achieved

Where next for the campaign?

PAGE
20

A world free from poverty

02-03

Trade justice is about giving poor people and countries the chance to work their own way out of poverty; giving farmers the chance to earn enough to feed their families and to send their children to school; allowing industries to develop, creating jobs and opportunities.

But instead of trade justice, free trade is being forced on developing countries. It is hurting poor people, not helping them. And it is undermining democracy by denying poor people a greater say in the decisions that affect their lives.

In 2005, unprecedented numbers of people campaigned for trade justice as part of the Make Poverty History campaign. And, with the UK government starting to question the wisdom of forcing free trade and liberalisation on developing countries, we are making progress. But there's still some way to go before trade justice becomes a reality for millions of poor people worldwide.

This guide addresses what is meant by trade justice, what needs to change, and how the campaign will help make poverty history.



Christian Aid/Penny Tweedie

Agatha wants to earn enough to send her son to school

She got a loan from her local church to set herself up as a poultry farmer. But because of cheap imports she is unable to sell her chicken in her local market. Her livelihood is at risk.

In 2004 the Ghanaian government announced that it would raise the tax on chicken imports. This would have given Agatha and other poultry farmers a lifeline. But the International Monetary Fund (IMF) intervened and the policy was never implemented.

The basics

Trade justice for the strapped-for-time

What is the Trade Justice Campaign calling for?

We want rich countries to stop forcing **liberalisation** and **free trade** on poor countries.

What is free trade?

Free trade is trade within and between countries that is free from government intervention – that is, no incentives for producers, and no barriers to trade. Removing this support and protection is devastating for poor farmers and industries, making it harder for countries to work their way out of poverty.

Rich countries argue that moving towards free trade is the best way out of poverty for poor countries. We disagree.

What is liberalisation?

Liberalisation is the gradual removal of government intervention in markets. A country can liberalise its trade policies by:

- stopping government help – eg by ending subsidies and removing government support for local producers
- opening markets by removing barriers that limit the amount of imports into a country
- privatising services such as water, health, education and transport.

What is trade justice?

Trade justice is the best chance for poor countries to combat poverty. It would give poor-country governments the flexibility to choose trade policies that will help promote development and lift the poorest people out of poverty.

The culprits – and what we demand

Who is forcing liberalisation and free trade on the poor – and how?

- 01** We want the **International Monetary Fund** and the **World Bank**, as well as rich-country governments, to stop attaching free-trade **conditions to aid, loans and debt relief**



1980-2000: 20 years of liberalisation

- ▶ Africa's share of world trade has fallen from six to two per cent*
- ▶ Growth in the per capita income of developing countries has fallen from three to 1.5 per cent **

04-05

02 We want **trade ministers** in rich countries and the European Commission to make **agreements at the World Trade Organisation** that give poor countries the right to determine their own economic policies.

03 We want the **EU and US** to stop forcing free trade on poor countries through **regional and bilateral trade agreements**.

Bujamma's husband is a victim of liberalisation

Bujamma Reddy's husband, Lachi, committed suicide on 2 February 2005. Despite trying to make a living from farming, he was deeply in debt. In 2004, 2,115 farmers like Lachi from India's Andhra Pradesh region took their own lives.

India had been encouraged by the IMF, World Bank and the UK Department for International Development (DFID) to liberalise and privatise its agricultural sector. However, removing government support and protection led to increasing levels of debt for poor farmers. Compounded by fluctuating market prices for crops and rising prices for seeds, pesticides, fertilisers and water, agriculture in the region is in crisis.

Policies that protect and support

Enforced free trade and liberalisation makes it harder for poor countries to work their own way out of poverty – and it has to stop.

Inappropriate liberalisation threatens the livelihoods of millions of farmers and traders in the developing world. **But what is truly unjust is that it denies governments of poor countries the right to choose policies that rich countries themselves used to develop their own economies.**

As the world's richest countries know only too well, government support can be essential for a new or struggling industry. Such help can take various forms, including:

- 01 **limiting unfair competition** by reducing cheaper imports, and requiring companies to use local products instead of those from abroad
- 02 **helping infant industries and poor farmers** by favouring local companies when giving out contracts, providing producers with the services they need (eg seeds, fertilisers and marketing), and offering preferential credit or tax incentives
- 03 **making sure investment by business benefits poor people** by regulating the activities of large transnational companies.

We say, if this was good enough for the rich North, then it should be good enough for the developing world as well.

* *Economic Development in Africa. Trade Performance and Commodity Dependence*, UNCTAD, 2004

** Dr Ha-Joon Chang, University of Cambridge

Exposing the myth Free trade and liberalisation

The mix-and-match approach

Successful economies tend to trade more – but this is not necessarily the result of more free trade.

The most successful economies use a **mixture of policies**. Vietnam, China and India have all developed strongly in recent years by liberalising some sectors while continuing to support others, especially new and vulnerable industries.

This mix-and-match approach is exactly what trade justice campaigners want – a **balance** of market forces and government intervention.

For and against – Christian Aid on liberalisation

We are not opposed to all forms of liberalisation. Nor do we say that protectionism is always the best policy for developing countries.

Liberalisation, if used appropriately, can lead to investment and healthy competition. And our research shows that protection and subsidies are most effective when they are used as an economic sector is built up – temporary and targeted, not permanent and across the board.

What we oppose is the promotion of liberalisation as a **one-size-fits-all** strategy for poor countries – just as we disagree with the idea that domestic protectionism should be ruled out altogether.

In short, what we want is for poor nations to be allowed to choose what's best for their own country.

Why rich countries are so convinced that liberalisation will benefit poor countries

Vested interests Free trade benefits the rich and powerful. As a result there is a lot of influential lobbying in favour of more and more of it.



Christian Aid/Felicia Webb

Consensus Due to the influence of those who benefit from free trade, there are mountains of reports and speeches that reinforce its standing – and make it harder for alternatives to be heard.

‘Sorry, did somebody say something?’ Those at the sharp end have plenty to say about the damaging effects of free trade. But, of course, these people – the poorest – are least able to get their voices heard.

Trade between poor countries

Goods from one poor country could still wipe out the income of particular communities in others. On the other hand a flexible trade agreement could allow each country to specialise in areas it had natural advantages in and then trade with its neighbours.

In the end it must be for poor countries to decide. And they must be free to choose to open their markets only to countries at similar stages of development – not be forced to open them to established big businesses in richer countries at the same time.

FAQ

Won't the Trade Justice Campaign result in small farmers being protected in a way that is ultimately unsustainable?

Many environmentalists would argue that small-scale production for local consumption is precisely the way of life that is sustainable.

Small farmers may need to move into another kind of employment in the long term. But it is wrong to take away the support they need to survive until new opportunities are available. And if new employment opportunities are to develop on a sufficient scale, the experience of the rich world is that, contrary to its free-trade sermonising, this will frequently require government assistance in the early years.

Government intervention in Mozambique

Louisa Mahele works on a sugar plantation in Mozambique. Her job, and 25,000 others, were created when, against the advice of the IMF, the Mozambique government set a price for sugar imported into the country. This policy meant that its own sugar industry would be able to compete. A viable sugar industry was essential to the rebuilding of Mozambique after the civil war and floods there. It has subsequently attracted investment from foreign sugar companies.

Exposing the myth

Market access and subsidies

'International trade between my country and the West is like a giraffe and an antelope competing for fruit that is at the top of a tree. You can make the ground beneath their feet level, but the contest will still not be fair.'

Rev Dr Aboagye-Mensah, Christian Council of Ghana

The wrong medicine

When rich governments advise poor countries on trade, they say that two things need to happen: that rich countries should cut subsidies to their own industries, and that poor countries should have greater access to sell their goods in the markets of rich countries.

Both would certainly benefit poor countries. But the Trade Justice Campaign thinks it's more important to call for poor countries to have the right to intervene in their own economies, as this will bring the greatest benefit to poor farmers and infant industries.

Here's why.

Access to markets in rich countries is all very well, but poor countries haven't got huge stock piles of exports waiting to flood into our country as soon as we open the gates. The priority of poor farmers is to sell their goods in **local** markets, not abroad.

Rich nations give huge **subsidies** to their manufacturers and growers (more than US\$300 billion to agriculture alone), the most damaging of which implicitly encourage **over-production**. Excess goods are then sold off cheaply in other parts of the world.

This is called **dumping**, and it drives down the price of goods on the world market – a **nightmare for poor exporters**. Thanks to the millions of dollars the US pays its cotton farmers in subsidies, Mali's economy is collapsing because its farmers can't get a fair price for their cotton.

However, as we have already said, most of the poorest people in the world do not produce goods for export. They make a

living selling produce in their local market. But because their countries have been forced to liberalise, livelihoods are threatened as the flood of cheap imports means farmers and manufacturers are unable to sell what they produce.

Tricks of the trade

Reciprocity

Giving market access and cutting subsidies have become bargaining chips in trade negotiations. In return, poor countries are expected to open their markets further.

The result? The small gains made by poor countries in accessing rich-country markets are outweighed by the damage done at home by a flood of cheap imports.

The EU and US have said they want to set a date for eliminating export subsidies (ie help with the costs of exporting goods). These only make up a small proportion of the total subsidies given. Yet, as part of negotiations at the World Trade Organisation (WTO), poor countries are expected to open their markets in return – not a very good deal.

'There is no point to a globalisation that reduces the price of a child's shoes but costs the father his job.'

Unnamed Filipino participant, International Labour Organization, World Commission on Social Dimensions of Globalisation

08-09

Down on the farm – a common tale

Many small farmers in the UK need government help. Subsidies should be targeted at those who need them, or to subsidise things like environmentally-friendly agriculture and traditional farming practices.

Most farmers, in rich countries and poor, face similar struggles – and know similar injustices. In the UK, for instance, small farmers are in a very weak negotiating position with the major supermarket chains, and often have to take whatever price they can get – just like farmers in poor countries do. In each case, market forces fail them; they are not economically powerful enough to negotiate fairly with big business and get a good enough price for the goods they work so hard to produce.

In the UK, 80 per cent of agricultural subsidies go to the richest 20 per cent of farmers.



Christian Aiz/Mary Grant

FAQ

Aren't cheap imports good for consumers in poor countries?

In poor countries around 70 per cent of people earn a living from agriculture. If cheap goods come in and compete with goods produced locally, it means the income of local people, who may already be living in poverty, goes down. This hurts the whole economy. In the UK, we've seen that when a major employer closes down it isn't just those who worked for that company who suffer, but local shops and services too – because people have less money to spend. Then more people lose their jobs. It's a vicious circle.

In the long run, as a country industrialises, fewer people may depend on agriculture. But the country needs to protect its industries and allow them to develop for that process to take place.



Put simply...

Imagine Martin lives in a town where the local council has the freedom to implement policies to encourage small businesses. He goes to them with a proposal for a coffee shop in the high street. So that he can compete with the big coffee chains that have branches in the town, the council:

- gives him preferential rent
- agrees to buy all its coffee from him
- prohibits big chains opening coffee shops in the high street for five years.

This is a fictional scenario, but it does make a point. Giving subsidies and incentives, protecting industries from competition, offering government contracts – these are all policies that poor-country governments could use to support and encourage their businesses and industries.

But, by being forced to accept free-trade policies and liberalisation, they are denied these options.

Trade justice simply means letting poor countries implement policies that will protect the poorest and most vulnerable producers, industries and consumers.

Exposing the myth Big business and privatisation

10-11

Investment or invasion?

Big business is best placed to take advantage of free trade. In an economy that has been opened up and liberalised, big corporations are able to:

- outbid local contractors for newly privatised services
- operate without government regulation
- enter a country freely and dominate the market.

What's more, multinational companies can exert great influence over governments in rich countries as well as poor.

Foreign investment can play a positive role in increasing employment and providing new goods and services in developing countries. However, it can undermine local businesses, and in too many cases companies in developing countries are guilty of evading local taxes and exploiting workers and the local environment.

The Trade Justice Campaign is not against investment – but governments need to be able to choose which sectors will benefit from investment, and maintain the right to regulate it properly.

FAQ

Isn't privatisation the answer when we know that nationalised industries can be so inefficient?

Privatising national industries can work and there are success stories. But where profit motives outweigh anti-poverty considerations it can be disastrous.

Privatisation is particularly dangerous when companies are asked to supply essential services to communities that have little or no money to pay for them. In Bolivia an international company that invested in the water sector increased prices and failed to provide better services.

There are some things governments need to take responsibility for – particularly in countries with large numbers of vulnerable people. Campaigns against water privatisation have been some of the largest and most passionate of all in poor countries – something we'd like rich countries to take into account when they encourage poor-country governments to undertake privatisation.

Exposing the myth

The role of poor-country governments

Home truths

Trade justice would give poor countries the **freedom** to choose their own economic policies.

But sadly there are no guarantees. There will always be a danger that governments will use such freedoms to the benefit of **vested interests** rather than the people as a whole. Rich-country governments do this too, after all.

The answer is not to take away economic freedom from poor countries. This is morally reprehensible and **undermines** their democracy.

It is also folly to believe that putting control of developing countries' economies in the hands of rich countries will lead to greater benefits for poor people. In fact, the experience of the last 20 years shows how little poor people have benefited from the economic reforms promoted, and in some cases imposed, by the rich North.

Instead, we would like to see assessments of particular policies' effectiveness. This would allow those affected by trade to have a real – and informed – say in how their governments set policy, strengthening democracy and making it easier for governments to be held to account for their actions.

Tricks of the trade

Conditions It is rare for a country to receive aid or debt relief without conditions attached. But there are good conditions – and there are bad.

Good conditions concern governmental process – eg transparency, reporting, accurate accounting. They ensure money is spent on development and doesn't end up in the bank accounts of unscrupulous leaders. Conditions like these strengthen the hand of the poor, help fight corruption and strengthen democracy.

Bad conditions seek to shape economic policy, effectively forcing poor countries to run their economies in ways that suit rich creditors – which basically means liberalising.

Guess which conditions rich countries pursue with most determination...

FAQ

Isn't corruption the real problem in poor countries?

Corruption does exist and is a problem in poor countries. And it thrives on poverty.

Organisations such as Christian Aid support the work of local organisations in developing countries as they try and hold their governments to account. But the most effective way to fight corruption is to fight poverty, and that means fighting alongside local people and campaigners around the world for trade justice.

Exposing the myth What about us?

12-13

The price of inaction

Some people you meet will ask ‘what will trade justice cost us?’

But the real question is:

‘what will it cost us to continue with things as they are now?’

Inequality, poverty and gross injustice fuel instability. A more just world is not only in poor people’s best interests. It is in those of all of us.

The Trade Justice Campaign is partly about showing the world that not only can we in the rich North afford to change our lifestyles – but we cannot afford not to.

The current global economic reality is unsustainable. At the moment poor countries are trapped in poverty, unable to develop their productive capacity. And keeping two-thirds of the world – and its valuable resources – in this position is hardly efficient. If poor countries were more productive, and had more money, rich countries would have better trading partners.

Whichever way you look at the state of trade and the way rich nations are resisting the need for change, it makes no sense. The Trade Justice Campaign is about highlighting this and trying to persuade the world’s richest and most powerful nations to work towards a better future for us all.

Put simply...

Free trade puts the weakest and strongest in direct competition – a bit like an unfair football match.

Imagine Chelsea playing against a pub team. It may be 11 versus 11, but Chelsea’s wealth gives them access to the best players, kit and training facilities.

Now add a referee and a set of rules that are biased towards Chelsea and we have a good illustration of how poor countries are being forced to compete with rich.

Trade works in favour of those who already have huge advantages. Even with a level playing field, farmers from poor countries still have little chance of competing with those from rich countries.

This is why it’s so important that poor countries are given the chance to use policies that will help poor farmers and industries to compete.



Christian Aid/Elaine Dufgenan

Turning rhetoric into policy change

The IMF and the World Bank

Jumping through hoops

The developing world is dependent on the international financial institutions – the IMF and World Bank – for loans and debt relief. But in order to qualify, poor countries are forced to implement free-trade policies and to liberalise their economies.

The more a country is seen to be liberalising its economy, the more favourably it is looked upon by the IMF and World Bank. The IMF has a ranking system: countries are granted greater access to finance – from the IMF and World Bank, but also direct from rich countries – the more liberalised their economies are.



Trade justice. Drop the debt. More and better aid.

In 2005 US\$40 billion in debt relief and US\$25 billion in aid for poor countries was promised by the G8. This must not come with trade liberalisation conditions attached or poor countries will be in danger of being worse off as a result.

14-15

Wealth is power

Basically the wealthier a country is, the greater its share of the vote at the World Bank and IMF. Five countries (the US, Japan, Germany, France and the UK) have nearly 40 per cent of the votes; the 50 poorest countries in the world have less than three per cent of the vote between them.

The US is the only country that can veto a decision, and even by voting together, poorer countries can't prevent a decision.

The UK is the fourth largest economy in the world and therefore has a relatively large share of the votes. Additionally Gordon Brown is currently chair of the steering committee at the IMF that makes decisions on overall policy.

Trade Justice Campaign demand

We want the World Bank and IMF to cease attaching economic strings to aid, loans and debt relief. Of course there have to be conditions to ensure this money is used well, but dictating harmful trade liberalisation policies hurts poor people, undermines development and is undemocratic.

Tricks of the trade

IMF and World Bank undermine agreements made at the WTO

Under WTO agreements poor countries do have the right to increase tariffs on certain goods to prevent their markets being flooded with cheap imports.

But poor countries are often unable to do this because of the conditions imposed by the IMF and World Bank on loans and debt relief that insist on tariffs being lowered.

The Ghanaian government passed legislation raising the tariff on imported chicken to help its own poultry farmers, but the IMF subsequently put pressure on the government, forcing it to reverse its decision. The tariff was never implemented.

Turning rhetoric into policy change

The World Trade Organisation

A bad deal

The WTO is where countries write the rules and agreements that govern global trade. About every two years, trade ministers from the member countries meet to negotiate the terms of new trade agreements, which are then taken forward in a vast array of ongoing meetings.

The UK is represented at the WTO by the European Commission. Trade ministers from the EU member countries agree a negotiating position that the European commissioner then takes to the WTO meetings. The commissioner is in a very powerful position – he represents one of the largest trading blocs, and as negotiations at the WTO develop he has to interpret the mandate given him by the EU members, making independent decisions about trade deals.

Each member of the WTO has an equal vote, yet it remains incredibly difficult for poorer countries to negotiate a better deal. There are two reasons for this.

01 Bullying

Rich countries negotiate with poor countries behind the scenes, putting them under severe pressure with threats of reducing aid or changing existing trade benefits.

‘Several delegations have said that if they stood out alone, their aid would be cut off by the major powers almost immediately,’ one development analyst said at the WTO’s 2001 meeting. ‘They do not see how they can express opposition when the pressure is this strong.’

02 Lack of capacity

Poor countries do not have the same resources to put into the negotiations as rich countries. It is simply impossible for some countries to be represented at all the negotiations that affect them. At the ministerial meeting in 2005 the EU had more than 800 negotiators; Burundi had just three.



Christian Aid/Louise Orton

WTO agreements to watch

AoA (agreement on agriculture)

This agreement, which sees rich countries demanding greater access to poor countries' markets in return for cutting their subsidies, is blatantly biased in favour of the West's agricultural producers.

NAMA (non-agricultural market access)

This is a proposal to open up the markets of poor countries to manufactured goods from rich countries. It could be a huge threat to poor countries, making it harder for them to develop their own industries.

GATS (general agreement on trade in services)

This agreement covers trade in services (rather than goods) such as financial services, and the provision of water, electricity, transport, etc. It is particularly controversial due to the pressure that some poor countries feel under to liberalise their basic services.

Tricks of the trade

Promising something they won't deliver

Rich countries who want to show their support for trade justice often say they want to reform their subsidies – safe in the knowledge it's probably not going to happen anytime soon.

The strong vested interests within the EU and US will make this a very difficult job for any government. And neither the US nor the EU is going to make the first move without the other also committing to reform.

Trade Justice Campaign demand

The WTO has agreed in principle that trade agreements should give special and differential treatment to poor countries – in other words, poor countries should have some flexibility to choose if, when and where they liberalise. Things could be changing. In recent years, some of the larger developing countries have started to group together and demand a better deal. Their voices must be heard and demands met so that poor countries are not forced to open up their economies further to rich countries.

Turning rhetoric into policy change

Regional trade agreements

'There is growing opposition and a well-founded fear of EPAs in Africa. The agreements threaten the livelihoods of millions of poor people by exposing them to unfair competition and forcing free trade on a continent which needs to protect its farmers and industries to allow them to develop.'

Nathan Irumba, former Ugandan ambassador to the WTO

EPAs – who benefits?

Countries also negotiate agreements between themselves. These may be bilateral (between two countries) or regional (between groups of countries).

Of particular concern to the campaign in the UK are the free-trade deals known as economic partnership agreements (EPAs).

Due to come into effect in 2008, EPAs are currently being negotiated between the EU and 77 African, Caribbean and Pacific countries (ACPs).

Despite apparent opposition from the UK, the EU continues to insist on ACPs opening their markets to European imports, while denying them the right to protect their farmers and industries, or select their own trade policies. The livelihoods of 750 million of the world's poorest people are at risk from these deals.

For ACPs, like all poor countries, the same obstacles arise at every negotiating table, including the WTO – the bullying of richer nations, and the lack of resources to be able to prepare as thoroughly as their wealthier co-negotiators.

Yet, despite the risks, there is a strong movement against EPAs in developing countries. ACP governments are expressing grave concerns, but thus far the EU isn't showing any signs of listening.



Christian Aid/Louise Orton

Analyse that

The European Commission asked analysts PricewaterhouseCoopers to undertake an impact assessment of EPAs for west Africa. Its conclusion was that EPAs will make it harder for poor countries to develop their own industries and that their exports may decline.



Christian Aid/Harriet Logan

UK u-turn

In response to pressure from campaigners, the UK government recently changed its tune on EPAs, putting it at odds with the rest of the EU. In March 2005, the government called for a review of the negotiations, stating that they **should not be used to force free trade and liberalisation on the ACPs**. However, the government has yet to back up its words with any action.

Tricks of the trade

EU undermines agreements made at the WTO

At the WTO's 2003 ministerial meeting in Cancun, poor countries managed to prevent agreements on issues like foreign investment and competition which would have further opened up their economies to rich countries. However, the EU is now trying to use the EPAs to reintroduce these issues.

Trade Justice Campaign demand

Regional trade agreements that give poor countries the flexibility to protect and support vulnerable farmers and producers.

A global campaign

What has the trade justice campaign achieved so far?

Gathering momentum

Since 2001 the campaign has turned trade from a concern of economists and civil servants into a moral debate, mobilising millions of people around the globe in a public call to world leaders for trade justice.

In 2005, in response to campaigning and public pressure, the UK government has started to reconsider its position – the first sign of a crack in the free-trade consensus.

In their own words

How the UK government's position on free trade changed

Then 'We remain an unshamed champion of free trade today...'

The UK prime minister, Tony Blair, 1998

Now 'We will not make our aid conditional on specific policy decisions by partner governments.' DFID, March 2005

'Forcing poor countries to liberalise through trade agreements is the wrong approach to achieving growth and poverty reduction in Africa.' Africa Commission, March 2005

'We will not force trade liberalisation on developing countries either through trade negotiations or aid conditionality.' DTI statement to the House of Commons, March 2005

'The Trade Justice Movement has reshaped the agenda of trade negotiations, and has turned the debate into a public and ethical, as well as economic, debate.'

Former trade and industry secretary, Patricia Hewitt MP.

20-21

Trade justice by numbers

- 2002** 12,000 people lobby more than half of all MPs
- 2003** Three-quarters of all MPs lobbied in their constituencies in a single day
- 2004** 8,000 people demonstrate for trade justice at the Labour party conference
- 2005**
- 10-16 April: 10 million campaigners in 80 countries take part in the Global Week of Action for trade justice
 - 2 July: 225,000 march in Edinburgh
 - 2 November: 8,000 campaigners lobby 375 MPs in London
 - December: 750,000 votes cast for trade justice

An historic step from the G8?

'It is up to developing countries themselves and their governments to take the lead on development. They need to decide, plan and sequence their economic policies to fit with their own development strategies...' Paragraph 31, G8 final communiqué, 2005

If put into action, this statement from the G8 summit in Scotland would mean the IMF, the World Bank and rich countries would no longer force poor countries to liberalise by attaching conditions to aid, loans and debt cancellation. But more campaigning is needed if world leaders are to act on their promises.

FAQ

Just what is the UK government's position?

In public, the government's been saying all the right things. But as the following excerpt shows, there's still some way to go before the words become action.

'The UK government is heavily engaged ensuring that the Doha negotiations are successful, and a measure of that success is to enable developing countries to **lock in trade liberalisation reforms.**' Leaked DFID paper, August 2005

A global campaign

So what next for the campaign?

The statements from the UK government in 2005 were historic. We cannot overestimate their significance.

Our challenge now is to turn those statements into policies that will deliver real benefits for poor people.

And for that to happen the voices of people affected by trade injustice must be heard. Rich-country governments, the IMF, the World Bank and the WTO must recognise the rights of poor people to have a say over their own future.

This means campaigning alongside campaigners in poor countries to support their specific demands for what needs to change in their own countries.

It's going to take a global campaign to overcome a global challenge.

'Your supporters are your best asset. They influence what other people think about issues. Your supporters carry on month-by-month, year-by-year. They keep on writing, having events and voting. They are consistent. Compared to other protesters they are the people who will count in terms of policy direction.'

Ann McKetchin, MP for Glasgow Maryhill

Can we succeed?

We have to.

It is an enormous task. But like the fight against apartheid, slavery and Third World debt, we have to believe that even against the odds, we have the power to bring about enormous change.

We refuse to settle for a world with poverty.

To join Christian Aid in campaigning for trade justice call

08700 787 788

or visit

www.christianaid.org.uk/campaign/joinus.htm



Back cover image:
Christian Aid/Brenda Hayward





London PO Box 100, SE1 7RT **Belfast** PO Box 150, BT9 6AE
Cardiff PO Box 21, CF14 2DL **Edinburgh** PO Box 11, EH1 1EL
Tel 020 7620 4444 **Fax** 020 7620 0719
www.christianaid.org.uk www.christianaid.ie

Registered company number 5171525 UK charity number 1105851