



attac

Newsletter102- page 1(1)
Please circulate and distribute.

Sand in the wheels

Weekly newsletter - n°102 – Wednesday 31 October 2001.

TINA – THERE IS NOW AN ALTERNATIVE

Content

1- Doha is in your backyard.

ATTAC will participate to a hundred mobilizations in 9 European countries. Other actions are organized around the world. In Beirut an international counter-summit will take place just before the WTO Ministerial in Doha. Even on the sea and in Doha... activists and delegates will discuss and propose alternatives to this Brave New WTO World.

2- WTO Tidbits

The US will not accept any discussion on safeguard measures for the GATS unless better market access conditions are agreed to by developing countries demanding safeguards (these having refused to discuss service liberalisation until safeguards are granted...); the big pharmaceutical labs fight to keep the TRIPs as it stands; what price the "quasi-consensus" of the informal meeting of trade ministers in Singapore? Consumers International supports NGO positions on Agriculture and Services.

3- World Trade Organization Wants To Control 'Services'

Granting corporations the opportunity to shove their fingers into the pies of health care, municipal services, and education means that disasters like California's experiment with utility privatization would become the norm. Last year's successful battle by workers and citizens against the privatization of Bolivia's water supply would be virtually impossible under a fully operational GATS.

4- WTO Ministers Likely to Face Difficult Choice on TRIPS, Public Health

Unable to bridge a divide between developed and developing countries over a ministerial declaration on intellectual property rights and public health, General Council Chairman Stuart Harbinson this weekend issued a draft that gives ministers at the November meeting in Qatar a tough choice between two alternatives.

5- People's Responses to the WTO, Exclusion or Inclusion?

However, in both cases, after the introduction of labor and environment standards into the NAFTA and the WTO, they have never made any effects. In other words, those kinds of standards failed to protect labor rights and environment.

6- Meeting ATTAC worldwide

Doha is in your backyard

Before everything we would like to point out that in Galicia (Spain) a vigil camp will start on November 2 in the city of Vigo. Organized by ATTAC Galicia and Rcade Vigo it aims at raising awareness in the city population. It will last until November 10. We would like to salute the effort made why all the activists to organize this week presence in a public space in the city. Solidarity messages can be sent to galicia@attac.org

Besides Vigo, you will meet us in Linz, in Helsinki, in Aachen, Berlin, Bielefeld, Bremen, Cottbus, Dortmund, Frankfurt-Main, Frankfurt-Oder, Friedberg, Hamburg, Hannover, Kassel, Köln, Leipzig, Marburg, München, Münster, Nürnberg, Oldenburg, Rostock, Regensburg, Schwerin, Wiesbaden, in Reims, Manosque, Gap, Nice, Valence, Foix, Montpellier, Marseille, Lannion, Périgueux, Bergerac, Nyons, Valence, Nîmes, Bordeaux, Rennes, Peyrou, Grenoble, Cahors, Laval, Nancy, Metz, Lille, Locarn, Dunkerque, Alençon, Bayonne, Strasbourg, Colmar, Chambéry, Rouen, Chalon sur Saône, Paris, Albi, Marseille, Limoges, in Guadeloupe, in Barcelona,

in Geneva and in Bern. You'll find other actions in Brussels and in London, in Italia, in Norway. Actions have been launched in New York and in other US cities, in Australia, in Canada, in Beirut, and so on...

Hundred of organizations are participating everywhere, unions after the IFCTU call for November 9, NGO and civil society organizations along with it or on November 10. Calls and Alerts letter are pouring into the networks. Greenpeace Rainbow Warrior will arrive in Doha either the 6 or the 7 November. You can contact Steve Shallhorn on board camp1@svrw.greenpeace.org. The boat will carry 32 persons from more than 12 countries. In Beirut (Lebanon) an international conference hosted by Arab NGOs and organizations will welcome hundreds delegates from around the world for the "World Forum on WTO".

And you what are you doing on November 9 and 10?

TO KNOW MORE AND TO TAKE PART :

On the occasion of the world-wide protest movements being organized on 9-10 November against a New Round of negotiations at the WTO meeting in Doha (Qatar), we invite you to visit the Internet website specially dedicated to this event : <http://attac.org/nonewround> You will find appeals, analyses, official documents, planned meetings and a daily WTO news sheet (to which you can subscribe on entering the website).

WTO Tidbits

By the Attac Work Group on International Treaties, Marseille

1) Tourism

A revised proposal from the Annex on Tourism, the aim of which is to discipline anti-competitive practices having an impact on sustainable tourism, has been presented by the Dominican Republic. Uruguay insisted on the fact that Tourism is a very important sector, representing a third of the total value of trade in services. It is also a source of foreign currency for almost all developing countries. A first move would be to improve existing commitments and do away with discriminatory limitations on the entry of foreign service providers. For Kenya, the GATS in its present state is incapable of dealing with anti-competitive practices. The EU, for its part, declared that it wanted a new round to deal in a general way with the question of competition.

The Americans said they failed to see how the Annex on Tourism would contribute to sustainable development or transport more tourists to destinations; they wondered what was meant in the proposals by "sustainable development".

On the setting up of emergency safeguard measures in connexion with the GATS, the US gave out in a communiqué that it would only agree to detailed discussions on a possible agreement on this subject if they were sure it would lead other members to make better commitments in negotiations on market access - to the stupefaction of many developing countries, which have always been in favour of setting up emergency safeguard measures. These countries have announced that they could not be expected to present other commitments during negotiations on the liberalization of services so long as they had not obtained an emergency exit clause.

2) Confronted with the developing world, pharmaceutical labs put up a fight to resist changes in the TRIPS.

Shannon Hertzfeld, deputy chairman of PhRMA (representing US labs), has declared that any causal link developing countries attempt to create between the public health problem and the protection of intellectual property rights "is basically an erroneous link". "If we thought that changing one word here and another word there in the TRIPS could save human lives, we would heartfully have changed them. But we are miles from the real problems here", he added.

"We believe that any weakening of the TRIPS would have a disastrous effect on continuing investment in research" (Rolf Krebs, Director of Boehringer Ingelheim, which makes the anti-Aids treatment Nevrapine).

"The debates on patents don't give the labs much help in deciding whether they should take an interest in anti-Aids research" (Harvey Bale, Director of the International Federation of Pharmaceutical laboratories).

"We want TRIPS to remain as it stands so that the industry can keep up its innovative work", he added.

The representatives of this industry have accepted that the Doha Declaration will probably say something about access to essential medicines because of political pressure on governments to



attac

deal with this subject. They will accept a declaration recognizing that nothing in the TRIPS can be interpreted as a measure preventing governments from dealing with public health demand.

"Beyond this, we must avoid the trap of saying anything that sounds politically correct but implies that TRIPS is an obstacle to raising public health standards. There is no proof of this."

To reduce recourse to the DSB on this subject "would send the message that whatever the rules are, they won't be applied", "Must we wait until the patent comes into the public domain?" (Declaration of the profession on September 19th)?

3) 22 countries meet informally in Singapore (October 13-14th)

At the "mini-Ministerial-Conference" of 22 trade ministers in Singapore on October 13th and 14th, Tanzania and Jamaica took their stand against the launch of a new round as presented in the July Zanzibar Declaration, despite reports of all participants favouring a "new round". India showed less enthusiasm than the developed countries, recalling that this was only an informal encounter between a small number of interested countries. India also remarked that there must be "consensus and not quasi-consensus", this being a reply to a comment by Lamy that a "quasi-consensus" had been reached. Malaysia showed its opposition by not being present at the meeting. Pakistan, echoing Brazil's remarks that the move to improve the annexes (to the Declaration on implementation of the agreements) was a step in the right direction, seemed to depart from its traditional position of taking sides with India on this subject. The US, moreover, indicated that Harbinson's text represented the furthest they could go in softening their position on implementation.

Finally, for the first time developing countries recognized the political pressure on certain governments, in the EU especially, where environment is concerned. There could subsequently be a gradual approach to this problem in two phases : first a study to clarify the issues, then a phase of negotiation.

The main advance was on agriculture. Particularly under discussion was the elimination of "blue box" subsidies (those applying to production-slowng procedures), and their assimilation with the

"green box" ones (those having less tendency to distort trade) or the "amber box" ones (those allowing internal subsidies with trade distortion effects but subject to a commitment to reduce these). But this text should go on being studied right up to Doha, because "Nobody can accept it as it stands" (Japan).

On intellectual property rights, delegates envisaged the establishment of rules for normal circumstances, and the application of exceptional rules in the course of public health crises. But disagreement remains on the definition of "crisis" and the manner of declaring it. This is one of the thorniest subjects to be dealt with in the run-up to Doha. Some worry that it could freeze efforts to launch a new round at Doha.

A new draft Ministerial Declaration could be communicated to delegates around October 20th. The General Council could hold a meeting at the beginning of November, the text being sent to the capitals for a final scrutiny before the Conference.

4) Consumers International criticises the Agreement on Agriculture and Services

CI considers this Agreement to be contrary to the interests of consumers, particularly in developing countries and transitional economies.

CI represents more than 260 consumer organisations from 120 countries.

According to CI, the present dispositions of the GATS would prevent states from regulating consumer access to basic services like water and telecoms. Trade negotiations should be oriented towards sustainable development (limited access to developed countries' markets, together with import subsidies, hit the competitive capacity of poor farmers and reduce consumer access to food). They should take the proposals of NGOs fully into account.

omc.marseille@attac.org

TO KNOW MORE AND TO TAKE PART :

On the occasion of the world-wide protest movements being organized on 9-10 November against a New Round of negotiations at the WTO meeting in Doha (Qatar), we invite you to visit the Internet website specially dedicated to this event : <http://attac.org/nonewround> You will find appeals, analyses, official documents, planned meetings and a daily WTO news sheet (to which you can subscribe on entering the website).



attac

World Trade Organization Wants To Control 'Services'

by Alex LoCascio

The events of September 11 have taken over the media spotlight from the movement against corporate-led globalization, which had previously been on the minds of governments, corporations, and social and labor movements alike.

But while the world mourns, the institutions of global capital have not slept. The World Trade Organization is moving forward with preparations for its next Ministerial meeting in the tiny Persian Gulf state of Qatar, November 9-13.

Many issues remain unresolved since the WTO's last Ministerial meeting in Seattle in November 1999, when a welcoming committee of unionists, environmentalists, and human rights activists sent the WTO packing. On the agenda is a set of rules and agreements being negotiated within the WTO: the General Agreement on Trade in Services, or GATS.

WHAT TO KNOW

GATS is a collection of 18 agreements set up to regulate the international trade in services. The broad term "services" covers everything from food service and hospitality to such vital public necessities as health care, police, firefighters, waste collection, water, sewage, utilities, and transportation.

Banking is also included, and the influence of multinational corporations representing this sector of the economy has been felt on GATS talks since the beginning. Says Director of the WTO's Services Division David Hartridge: "Without the enormous pressure generated by the American financial services sector, particularly companies like American Express and Citicorp, there would have been no services agreement."

Behind the push to hammer out GATS are such powerful lobbying groups as the U.S. Coalition of Service Industries, with members such as AOL Time-Warner, AT&T, Enron, Citigroup, and UPS. USCSI takes major credit for setting the GATS agenda.

It's easy to see why such companies are hot to finalize GATS implementation. About 60 percent of the global economy is in the service sector, and services account for about 70 percent of the

domestic U.S. economy. Health care and education are worth about \$3.5 trillion and \$2 trillion on a global scale, respectively.

These essential services, and others such as water, waste collection, postal services, and public transit, are often administered by state, local, and federal governments which are responsible to representatives elected by citizens. If fully implemented, GATS would ensure that decision-making about these potentially lucrative services would reside instead with non-accountable WTO bureaucrats and the corporations they serve.

As it currently stands, GATS is a contradictory hodgepodge, with not all service sectors in all member countries covered. The purpose of the current round of negotiations is to extend GATS to cover all sectors.

SERVICE = ALMOST ANYTHING

As defined by the WTO, a service is "anything you can't drop on your foot." And while GATS specifically excludes services provided "in the exercise of government authority," the agreement includes those public services which are already delivered commercially or in competition with the private sector. Thus public schools (which "compete" with private schools), for-profit prisons, and public health services "in competition" with HMOs are all fair game under GATS.

Central to GATS is the surrender of national sovereignty and democracy to the interests of transnational corporations. Its provisions are a veritable corporate wish-list, including:

- unrestricted, guaranteed access for all corporate service providers to domestic markets in all service sectors in all member states.
- Most Favored Nation status, which would force member nations to disregard the labor, environmental, or human rights records of service providers from other member nations.
- the removal of such "barriers to trade" as government subsidies to domestic service providers in fields such as public works, municipal services, and social programs. Curiously, the military and defense sectors are left off the list of services covered by GATS, so the huge expenditures governments shower on defense contractors are not threatened.



attac

·"transparency" for any proposed government regulations that would potentially affect services. What this means in practice is that governments would be forced to consult with WTO bureaucrats before implementing policies that would potentially affect GATS.

U.S. LOBBYISTS

Granting corporations the opportunity to shove their fingers into the pies of health care, municipal services, and education means that disasters like California's experiment with utility privatization would become the norm. Last year's successful battle by workers and citizens against the privatization of Bolivia's water supply would be virtually impossible under a fully operational GATS.

WTO chief Michael Moore has delivered ultimatums to member states about the necessity of publicly and vigorously defending GATS against the potential of citizens' campaigns. But transnational corporations and their politician-supporters are assuming that trade issues are safely out of the public eye for now. A forceful and visible organized opposition is necessary to shatter their illusions.

Alex LoCascio.

Published in collaboration with Labor Notes. 'Labor Notes' is a monthly magazine based in Detroit, USA. We are committed to reforming and revitalizing the labor movement. We report news about the labor movement that you won't find anywhere else. News about grassroots labor activity, innovative organizing tactics, international labor struggles, immigrant workers, and problems that some union leaders would rather keep quiet. Subscribe and receive a copy of 'Labor Notes' in your mailbox! Subscription information can be found at our website at www.labornotes.org

WTO Ministers Likely to Face Difficult Choice on TRIPS, Public Health

Unable to bridge a divide between developed and developing countries over a ministerial declaration on intellectual property rights and public health, General Council Chairman Stuart Harbinson this weekend issued a draft that gives ministers at the November meeting in Qatar a tough choice between two alternatives.

The first option would effectively carve-out an exemption for obligations under the Agreement on

Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights by having ministers agree that "Nothing in the TRIPS Agreement shall prevent Members from taking measures to protect public health," according to the Oct. 27 declaration reprinted below. Brazil, India and the African Group are pushing this option.

The second option reflects text backed by the U.S., Switzerland, Japan and Canada, and notes that the declaration "does not add to or diminish the rights and obligations of Members provided in the TRIPS agreement." Under this option, ministers would affirm countries' right to "use, to the full, the provisions in the TRIPS Agreement which provide flexibility to address public health crises such as HIV/AIDS and other pandemics."

The European Union, which has tried to broker a middle ground in the fight, did not sign on to the U.S.-backed proposal, but was involved in its drafting, trade sources said.

One official did claim that the developing-country option on TRIPS language already made accommodations to the concerns of the U.S. and other countries with research-based pharmaceutical industries. The developing country proposal says ministers would reiterate "their commitment to the TRIPS Agreement" and "reaffirm the right of WTO Members to use, to the full, the provisions in the TRIPS Agreement which provide flexibility" for public health measures, language which closely tracks that backed by the U.S.

Harbinson's draft either fails to resolve or puts off until a later date resolution of controversies on what exactly the "flexibilities" are in the TRIPS agreement that countries could use to protect public health.

The question of whether countries without their own manufacturing capacity can issue a compulsory license for production in a third country is referred to the TRIPS Council, with instructions to report back -- but not necessarily make a decision -- by the end of next year. U.S. industry considers this timetable too short, given its view that this is not a potential hindrance to access to medicines until such countries must provide patent protection in 2006, sources said.

The draft basically restates existing provisions on parallel imports, under Article 6. It does not include language put forward by developing countries that would allow parallel imports of

items from countries where they are not under patent protection or are under compulsory licenses.

At the same time, the latest Harbinson draft no longer tightens parallel import provisions as the U.S. has pushed through a narrow interpretation of what constitutes a patent holder's exhaustion of rights.

Harbinson's draft would exempt least-developed countries from having to provide patent protections for pharmaceuticals for another ten years, until Jan. 1, 2016. The current deadline is Jan. 1, 2006.

This is essentially part of a U.S. backed proposal that U.S. Trade Representative Robert Zoellick informally floated at a Singapore meeting earlier this month. The offer also included a promise not to pursue dispute settlement cases against sub-Saharan African countries if they took public health measures for HIV/AIDs, tuberculosis and malaria (Inside U.S. Trade, Oct. 19, p. 21). One official downplayed the importance of the extension offer in the text, saying that the TRIPS agreement already that extensions on all TRIPS obligations "shall" be provided "upon duly motivated request."

But Zoellick's offer to exercise "due restraint" in bringing dispute settlement cases against sub-Saharan countries is strengthened in Harbinson's draft into an agreement that dispute procedures "shall not be exercised" for five years from the date of the declaration. Industry sources said there was little difference between the two proposals, but that the stronger formulation is more likely to give confidence to African countries.

Like Zoellick's proposal, the agreement would only apply to measures taken to ensure access to drugs necessary to treat HIV/AIDS or other pandemics. Harbinson's draft also includes the caveat that dispute settlement moratorium only applies to "non-discriminatory" measures.

The draft's formulation that the TRIPS agreement be read "in light of its object and purpose" is close to the emphasis the developing countries want placed on social and public health objectives. But the U.S. will likely object, sources said. It has proposed language that ties interpretation to the other parts of the agreement, such as patent rules.

The declaration also contains alternative brackets in the title, reflecting the difference between developing countries' push that it address the relationship between TRIPS and public health, and the U.S.-led effort to limit the scope to "access to medicines."

Developing countries want the declaration to cover other medical supplies beyond medicines as well as ingredients, also under patent, that are used in the manufacture of medicines. Brazil, for example imports ingredients for the production of anti-AIDS drugs from India, where they are not under patent protection, one official said.

New Draft WTO Ministerial Declarations
<http://attac.org/nonewround/wot/doc/>

TO KNOW MORE AND TO TAKE PART :

On the occasion of the world-wide protest movements being organized on 9-10 November against a New Round of negotiations at the WTO meeting in Doha (Qatar), we invite you to visit the Internet website specially dedicated to this event : <http://attac.org/nonewround> You will find appeals, analyses, official documents, planned meetings and a daily WTO news sheet (to which you can subscribe on entering the website).

People's Responses to the WTO, Exclusion or Inclusion?

By Lee, Chang-geun

Two Different Strategies

There are two strategies to the WTO in international movements: One is the strategy of inclusion, and the other those of exclusion.

The inclusion strategy is connected with so-called labour standards which was argued by AFL-CIO in Seattle, 1999. The AFL-CIO has demanded that labor standards be included as a topic at the WTO meetings. This strategy is based on the belief that labour standards introduced into the WTO system could protect labor rights against free trade and that it could make the speed of globalization slower and smoother. This is not only the official position of the ICFTU, but also the way NGOs have traditionally respond to free trade agreements. However, the inclusion strategy was clearly proved not to be effective through the experience of NAFTA.

Nowadays, more and more activists pay attention to the other strategy, that is, the strategy of



attac

exclusion. This was initiated by farmers, firstly, around the time of Seattle Ministerial conference, 1999. As you know, after inauguration of the WTO, farmers in the Third World countries has been affected most seriously. WTO impose cut-back of subsidy and openness of agricultural market. So, farmers especially from the Third world countries have started to demand that Agreement of Agriculture(AOA) should be taken out of the WTO. In this context, nowadays, activists argue that essential sector for human being, livelihood should be exempted from the WTO.

Inclusion Strategy Proved Abortive

Which strategy is more attractive for you? Now I will compare with each other in terms of possibility to be realized and its effectiveness.

If we consider only the reality, inclusion strategy would be better. Actually it has a long history since 1980s in NGOs' responses to Free Trade Agreements and international institutions. It was called as 'Social Clauses'. That is, NGOs intended to smoothed international (or regional) agreement on free trade and investment through Social Clauses such as Labor Standards, Environmental Standards, and Human Rights Standards. Moreover, Social Clauses were seen more attractive because new trade agreements had strong measures ? for example, trade sanctions? to enforce the standards, while existing ILO had no compulsory means to do it.

The efforts to include Social Clauses in trade agreements were realized in the NAFTA (1994) and in the WTO (1995). NAFTA is the first case that labor and environmental standards are introduced as a form of sub-agreement. Those are Labor Committee and Environment Protection Committee. The WTO has also a similar structure named Trade and Environment Commission.

However, in both cases, after the introduction of labor and environment standards into the NAFTA and the WTO, they have never made any effects. In other words, those kinds of standards failed to protect labor rights and environment.

Actually, after the inauguration of the NAFTA, 420,000 jobs were disappeared and real wages were dropped by 4,400 US dollars(yearly estimated figure) in U.S. Also in Mexico, 20,000-28,000 small and medium-sized companies were bankrupted and then it resulted in the loss of 2 million regular jobs. In conclusion, AFL-CIO failed

to protect its unionists interest(jobs and wages) as well as Mexican workers rights through the strategy of labor standards.

The ineffectiveness of punishment measures was proved in the case of Sprint, U.S.-based telecommunication company. The workers had petitioned the Labor Committee of NAFTA to investigate the violation of labor standards in the company. But as usual the only result was its slow response and ineffective punishment; Several years after the petition, the Committee decided to impose small amounts of fine to the company and closed the case. That's the way the standards work.

TINA: There Is NOW Alternative.

The exclusion strategy, as mentioned above, was initiated by farmers, firstly, around the time of Seattle Ministerial conference, 1999. The growing support for the strategy is based upon activists' perception that the inclusion strategy cannot be an effective response to neo-liberal globalization any more, which was well proved in NAFTA and WTO. They come to agree that neo-liberal globalization is not inevitable and more fundamental and radical approaches can be formulated.

An important turning point was Anti-MAI campaign. In October 1998, you maybe have heard about 'Cultural Exception'. This was argued by French government during the negotiation of Multilateral Agreement on Investment(MAI). Due to the withdrawal of French Government from the table, MAI negotiation had to be stopped. I won't explain what the MAI is in this text. However, the point is that it is a kind of Constitution of Trans-nationals.

Anyway, when going on the MAI negotiation, international NGOs, social movement groups and trade unions cried out to stop the MAI negotiation, No to MAI. From radical groups to conservative environmental groups, all of them argued opposition to the MAI. Finally, as I said above, MAI was failed.

Since struggles against MAI, international social and labor movement can have considered another strategy which is different from inclusion strategy. That is, exception(or Exclusion) strategy which aims to dismantle whole agreements or institutions.



attac

Apparently, 'exclusionists' come to obtain their citizenship in international solidarity movements. By the mid-1990s, activists who argued for the dismantle of WTO had been usually regarded as a kind of idealist. However, as the contradiction of financial globalization deepened and the inclusion strategy was found to fail to control it, the exclusion strategy began to be considered as a realistic alternative. A lot of activists realized that there was no seat reserved for people's life and basic rights in the MAI text, which was very eager to keep the business's benefits exclusively.

Two alternatives are being discussed: One is global control of capital flow and the other is 'delinking' from the world system. Both strategies are common in the dismantle of current trade and investment system and the opposition to additional negotiation for liberalization.

But, they are different in what will be the next. In order to control the WTO, the former argued that UNCTAD, presumably more progressive and relatively corporative to people's agenda, should have more power in the trade agreement negotiations. On the other hand, The latter gives more focus on the national dimension. It insists that to control rampant globalization, each nation-states restore the power to get the capital flow under control, and to make it happen, it gives emphasis on radical democracy in the national and local levels.

What KoPA Demands

KoPA's strategy on WTO? also Bilateral Investment Treaties(BIT)? is closer to the latter rather than the former. KoPA thinks the inclusion strategy has already failed to get any positive results, and also it only helps the current stream of globalization including WTO, FTA and BIT to be strengthened and expanded. Therefore, KoPA argues strongly that Agreements on essential sectors to the people including agriculture, education, health, culture, and drinking water must be taken out of the WTO.

However, KoPA also recognize the reality of power relations on international scale.

So KoPA uses short-term tactics of Postponement(or Moratorium) in parallel with exclusion strategy. This is a kind of tactics for saving-time. Actually, last year around on Seattle Ministerial Conference, KoPA demanded the delay of any additional agreements for more liberalization and openness including New Round

of the WTO and BITs until a total re-evaluation and re-examination of the existing WTO treaties with the full participation of citizens, social movement organizations and trade unions have been completed, especially its effects on democracy, environment, public health care, human rights, labor rights, and women's rights.

Building People's Network

Lastly, I'd like to add some my viewpoints about how to build people's network on globalization including its instruments such as WTO, IMF and World Bank.

KoPA is composed of more than 40 NGOs, social movements and trade unions. So, at this time, you might be wondering how it could be built as a broad network even including environmental group and consumers group against the WTO. Actually, building this kind of broad network on the WTO is a current characteristics not only in KoPA but also in the area of international actions. In Seattle 1999, so many kinds of groups such as trade union, farmers group, environmentalists, AIDS activists, human rights group, and student groups were struggling against the WTO. The reason is very simple. The WTO is affecting all of them whether directly or indirectly.

There's one example. In Korea, there is a network against Genetic Engineering Organisms (GMO) which has a very close connection with KoPA. Last year KoPA organized a campaign against GMO and the WTO with this network. Many consumers group and environmental group in Korea are members of this network. What's the connection between GMO and the WTO? Actually, the WTO permits almost free trade of GMO and don't admit any restriction on its trade.

Especially U.S. demands strongly that the WTO should ensure complete free trade of GMO. However, more and more scientists and environmentalists are warning that GMO could hurt human health as well as ecological system. In this context, environmental and consumers group are getting involved in the actions against the WTO.

There's another example. If I tell you that even AIDS activists are deeply participating in the campaigns against the WTO, you are sure to be very surprised. What's the relationship between AIDS and the WTO? Please, think about it.



From these cases, we can get some ideas about why so many various groups are involved in the actions and networks against the WTO. This trends reflects that current globalization and the WTO are affecting on more and more people and sectors.

Lee, Chang-geun. Steering committee member for the PSSP, KOPA policy coordinate (Korea)

Meeting ATTAC worldwide.

If you are interested in one of these rendezvous please click on <http://attac.org/rdv/> Then select the country in which it will take place to find further information.

Wednesday 31: DEUTSCHLAND: BAD HERRENALB / ESPANA: MADRID / FRANCE: PARIS 11 – ATTAC SORBONNE – CLERMONT FERRAND

Thursday 01: FRANCE: ROUEN / NORGE: NESODDEN / SUISSE-SCHWEIZ: BERNE / SVERIGE: UPPSALA

Friday 02: FRANCE: METZ – CAHORS – ROUEN

Saturday 03: FRANCE: PARIS 11 – ALES - TOURS

Sunday 04: FRANCE: PARIS 11 – TOURS / NORGE: OSLO

Monday 05: AUSTRIA: GASTHOF / FRANCE: BAGNOLS – PERIGUEUX – LILLE – PARIS 9-10 – ROUEN – ANNEMASSE – REIMS / ITALIA : MILANO / SVERIGE : ALINGSAS - STOCKHOLM

Tuesday 06: DEUTSCHLAND: MUNSTER / ESPANA: MADRID / FRANCE: CHARTRES – PARIS 11 – NANTES – LAVAL – ALES – BRETAGNE SUR ORGE – PARIS 15 – LA TOUR D'AIGUES – JUSSIEU – DOUAI – MARIGNIER / SUISSE-SCHWEIZ : LAUSANNE / SVERIGE : UPPSALA

Wednesday 07: AUSTRIA: WIEN / ESPANA: MADRID / FRANCE: LA ROCHETTE – PARIS 11 – VOIRON – PARIS 13 – CACHAN – LILLE – TOULOUSE – ROYAN – PARIS 9-10 - REIMS