DEBT CANCELLATION
FAIR TRADE
FOOD SECURITY
HUMAN RIGHTS
NATURAL RESOURCES
ENVIRONMENT
EDUCATION
Contents

From the Director .......................... 5
Regional and Global Paradigms Programme .......... 6
  • Alternatives to trade, investment and financial liberalisation .......... 7
  • Alternative security .......... 18
Micro-Macro Issues Linking Programme .......... 24
  • Regional and Global .......... 25
  • Lao (PDR) .......... 28
  • Thailand .......... 30
  • India .......... 34
Organisation Management and Development .......... 38
Publications and Resources .......... 43
Publications .......... 45
Finances .......... 49
Funders .......... 52
1999 was not just another year in Focus. In March, we hosted the historic civil society conference on global financial reform in Bangkok, the ground zero of the Asian financial crisis. The conference brought together over 400 of the leading thinkers and activists on global financial and trade issues to discuss the origins and dynamics of the crisis, as well as solutions that would put the interests of people ahead of the banks, hedge funds, and corporations.

Towards the end of the year, in late November and early December, Focus was a participant in the Battle of Seattle that brought the World Trade Organization to a halt. I was personally kicked and beaten up by the Seattle police, as were several hundred other civil society representatives, but this was a very small price to pay in the struggle to force the world to take notice of the dark side of the TNC-led globalization that is bringing so much misery to hundreds of millions of people throughout the world.

In between these two events, my colleagues in the Focus staff, guided by the Board, did their usual excellent research, analytical, advocacy, and capacity-building work on trade, finance, development, environment, and comprehensive security. All this would not have been possible, however, without the cooperation of friends and civil society groups throughout the world and the support of our funders.

As we enter the new millenium, misery and hope coexist, as do perils and promises. We at Focus are committed to contributing our share, however small or insignificant this may be, of the collective effort to tip the balance in favor of the forces of hope.

Walden Bello
Executive Director
Regional and Global Paradigms Programme
Alternatives to trade, investment & financial liberalisation

Trade liberalisation

The work programme in 1999 focused on the Agriculture Analysis and Information Exchange (AIE) process that was in full swing throughout the year, as well as the governmental preparation for the WTO Seattle Ministerial Conference in Geneva. The AIE process was overseen by the WTO Committee on Agriculture. It allowed WTO member governments to submit discussion papers on issues concerning them pertaining to the Agreement on Agriculture.

The overriding objective was building the capacity of Southern governments in these processes in order to advance the negotiating positions of developing countries. We were interested in this for two reasons.

The Agreement on Agriculture is one of the most iniquitous agreements in the WTO for developing countries. Its rules were tailored to suit the interests of the developed agricultural exporting countries and its implementation since 1995 has exacerbated the rural crisis in many developing countries. Yet in the AIE process in 1998, the majority of developing countries were not active participants, even though their concerns were very different from the issues put forward by the groups that were most active, such as the Cairns Group, the US, the multifunctionality group, etc.
In 1999, Focus on the Global South assisted in the AIE process by providing technical papers on key issues relating to the Agreement on Agriculture and developing countries. Papers written covered the following topics: Market Access, The Marrakesh Decision, Food Security, Special and Differential Treatment, Domestic Supports. Together with the South Centre, we organised meetings with Southern governments. This process encouraged developing countries to play a much more active role in the AIE process and, in so doing, it advanced the negotiating positions of the countries with whom we worked. Most importantly, it brought the development perspective - the concerns of small farmers and food security — into the governmental debates in Geneva. For example, our efforts to promote a ‘food security box’ in the Agreement on Agriculture found its way into the 19 October Draft Ministerial Declaration which was brought to Seattle for further negotiations by governments.

Our representative was based in Geneva for six months prior to the Seattle Ministerial. Aside from the work on agriculture, we worked closely with governments on their positions prior to the Seattle meeting and actively lobbied governments to oppose new issues and to a new round. We also provided governments with support and information regarding new areas that were being suggested by some developed countries, such as biotechnology. In addition, we raised timely concerns on apparently benign issues — such as ‘coherence’ and ‘transparency’ — which were slipping into the WTO agenda.

Apart from the substantive gains, this process — which included meetings with governments, regular phone calls, encouraging the submission of joint position papers and which was a joint effort between Focus and the South Centre - brought developing country delegates together, and encouraged a sense of solidarity amongst a group of like minded countries. Our lobbying and assistance provided moral support to the delegates with whom we worked closely. For example, we provided these countries with a draft ministerial declaration from a South perspective, several days prior to the Ministerial when it was clear that negotiations were at a stalemate and at the time the EU tabled its own draft declaration. While our draft was never used, some developing country delegates did bring it to Seattle and were prepared to use it depending on how the talks proceeded.

We provided the wider NGO community with regular information updates and analyses throughout the year on agriculture and WTO issues in general. This was an important contribution to the building of the larger NGO movement prior to the Seattle Ministerial.

The articles we wrote were disseminated via Focus’ electronic bulletin Focus on Trade. There is a complete listing of all publications at the end of this report.
**Workshops and Meetings Attended in 1999**

**February 2-6**
International Forum on Agriculture workshop, Cuenevaca, Mexico.

**February 24-25**
Conference on People’s Response to the Food Security Crisis in Southeast Asia, Organised by the Southeast Asian Food Security and Fair Trade Council, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia. Presented a paper on the ‘Agreement on Agriculture and Developing Countries’.

**March 5**
Workshop on ‘WTO and Developing Countries’ organised by the International Economic Integration Unit of Vietnam’s Ministry of Foreign Affairs, and sponsored by Oxfam (GB). Presented a paper ‘The WTO and Developing Countries: Will Vietnam Benefit from Being a WTO Member?’

**June 10**
Geneva - Meeting with the Sudanese Delegation. Sudan is in the process of accession. Made a short presentation on the experience of developing countries at the WTO. This was a Sudan / South Centre initiative.

**June 21-23**
Workshop on Agriculture and the WTO organised principally by IATP and Protestant Farmers (Germany), in Geneva. Focus and the Southeast Asia Food Security and Fair Trade Council was represented on the steering committee. As part of that work, we played a major role in organising governments to meet with NGOs and to speak on their positions on agriculture at the WTO. Made a short presentation on the Agreement on Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures from the point of view of developing countries.

**July 8-9**

**August 18 - 19**
NGO workshop ‘Southern Agenda for the Next Millennium - Role of the Civil Society’, Bangalore, organised by CUTS. The meeting was held in conjunction to the G15 meeting on the WTO. Presented a paper on the State of Negotiations on the Agreement on Agriculture at the WTO.

**September 15-17**
‘Orientation Workshop for Newly Posted Delegates in Developing Country Missions to the WTO’, organised by the South Centre, Geneva. Presented a paper on ‘NGOs’ Perspectives on the WTO’. The paper highlighted the key problems with today’s neoliberal economic agenda.

**September 18**
‘High Level Forum on Trade and Environment’, Convened by Gary Sampson (LSE) and James Cameron (FIELD), Geneva. (Observer)

**September 20-21**
WTO / World Bank Joint Conference on Developing Countries’ Interests in A Millennium Round, Geneva.

**September 23-24**
FAO Symposium on ‘Agriculture, Trade and Food Security: Issues and Options in the Forthcoming WTO Negotiations from the Perspective of Developing Countries’.

**October 7-8**
As part of a civil society advocacy effort around ASEM, the Transnational Institute (TNI) and Asia House (Germany) organised a series of meetings with parliamentarians and bureaucrats from Germany. As part of a team of three persons from Asia, I took this opportunity to talk about the WTO and developing countries. Issues covered ranged from the structure of the future negotiations, agriculture, the SPS agreement, investment, social clause and the WTO’s dispute settlement system.

The persons we met included:
- Dr Hans-Christian Reichel and Herr Kupitz, Ministry of Economics, Chief of staff for ASEM;
- Mr Thomas Poese, Head of DGB’s section for International Affairs (DGB is the umbrella organisation of trade unions in Germany);
- Dr Hans Schipulle, Deputy Director General of the Federal Ministry of Economic Co-operation and Development;
- Mr Kalus-Jurgen Hedrich, speaker of the party on development issues, Christian Democratic Party;
- Ms Claudia Roth, Chair of Human Rights Commission of the German Parliament;
- Dr Angelika Koster-Losaack, speaker of the party on development issues, Green Party;
- Dieter Ernst, State Secretary of the Berlin Senate for Economic, Enterprise and the Coordination on Development Issues.

**November 26 - December 3**
WTO Ministerial, Seattle. Presented reports to two NGO panels on Biotechnology and Implications on the inclusion of a Working Group in the WTO. The Southeast Asian Council also held a press conference and an NGO briefing on the state of negotiations in Agriculture and other WTO issues. Walden Bello and Minar Pimple also took part in various meetings, events and protests during the WTO ministerial meetings.
Investment and financial liberalisation

The programme highlight for 1999 was the international conference *Economic Sovereignty in a Globalising World: Creating People Centred Economics for the 21st Century*.

Over 340 participants from more than 40 countries took part in the four-day meeting from 23-26 March in Bangkok. Focus on the Global South was the key organiser, with collaboration from the DAWN and SAPRIN networks.

In the months that followed, it became evident that this conference had significance beyond the four days in Bangkok. It is viewed by many as a ‘watershed’ event which brought together various elements of the progressive left debate — from the North and the South — about politics, economics and development, including critiques of the development paradigm, the role of the international financial institutions and international capital and the possibilities for regulation of international financial markets, all in the context of ‘people-centred’ alternatives.

The papers from the conference are available from Focus and are posted on the website, focusweb.org. In addition, we have selected and edited key papers which will be published in September 2000 by Zed Books and Focus on the Global South as *Global Finance: New Thinking on Regulating International Speculative Capital*.

Focus is very grateful to Geoff Keele who assisted with the media and publicity for the conference, and would like to acknowledge the extraordinary hard work of the all the Focus staff, as well as our many excellent student volunteers. They all helped make the conference a success.


Overview

The discussions reflected the extraordinary diversity of participants and high quality of their contributions. They combined historical perspectives and analyses of processes leading up to the current crisis with practical policy recommendations and NGO campaigning strategies at national, regional and global levels. The thrust of the strategic
discussions focused on the need to ‘create spaces’ for more autonomous decision-making by governments at various levels, in a manner that would be democratically informed by human rights principles, sustainability and social development objectives.

The guiding principles for such a “people-centered” reform agenda could be captured in three “subordinations” proposed by Focus on the Global South:

- subordination of macro- and other economic policy-making goals to human development and social policy goals;
- subordination of global level governance mechanisms to those at the local, national and regional ones, following the principles of subsidiarity; and
- subordination of the financial “bubble” economy to the real productive economy.

**Transnational Causes of Financial Crises**

Throughout the sessions, many speakers took time to present the current crisis in historical perspective. John Dillon, from the Canadian Ecumenical Coalition for Economic Justice said financial crises have been a recurring pattern for nearly two centuries. However, the frequency of financial crises has increased since the Bretton Woods system of fixed exchange rates broke down in the early 1970s. The 1994-95 crisis in Mexico and the 1997 crisis in Asian countries were largely due to large inflows of foreign capital and not primarily the result of macro-economic mismanagement by the countries concerned. The same argument was made about the more recent collapse of the Brazilian Real in early 1999.

Such an analysis of the primary causes of financial crises contrasts sharply with the prevailing view among many G7 nations and executive boards of the international financial institutions (IFIs) which have, until very recently, unequivocally identified the causes solely in terms of the failure of national governments to get the “fundamentals” right.

According to Walden Bello from Focus on the Global South, more emphasis on identifying the “supply-side” causes of crises relating to transborder capital movements would also do much to explain the origins of the debt crisis.

**The Ascendancy of Finance**

Many speakers at the conference referred to UNCTAD’s analyses on the dangers of the ascendancy of finance over the real economy. The UNCTAD *Trade and Development Report 1998*, states that “modern financial markets are organised less to create wealth and employment than to extract rent by buying and selling second-hand assets, and the ‘discipline’ these markets exert on policy-makers reinforces the advantages of existing wealth-holders.” This ascendancy has been associated with technological changes and the wave of liberalisation policies in the 1980s. A framework paper prepared by Focus on the Global South showed that

- As commercial banks pulled back from international lending after their overexposure in debt-ridden developing countries, other major financial players emerged as key conduits for cross-border capital flows, including investment banks (such as Goldman Sachs and Merill Lynch), mutual funds, pension funds and hedge funds.
- The role of banks and conventional lending for the raising of funds was eclipsed by “securitization,” or the transfer of capital via the sale of stocks or bonds. By 1993, securities accounted for US$521.7 billion of international lending, compared to US$136.7 billion in bank loans.
There was an explosion of both old and new activities and instruments such as arbitrage and derivatives. Arbitrage takes advantage of foreign exchange or interest-rate differentials to turn a profit, while trading in derivatives refers to buying and selling the risk of an underlying asset without trading the asset itself. Derivatives have been described as very esoteric instruments, which are difficult to understand, monitor or control. They include such instruments as futures, forward contracts, swaps and options.

By the mid-1990s, the daily volume of transactions in foreign exchange markets has been estimated at over US$1.2 trillion, only a tiny fraction of which is said to “trickle down” into the real economy. According to the framework paper, one dimension of the ascendancy of finance over the real economy is the increasing role of financial operators with access to large amounts of finance capital working with large stockholders in skewing the behaviour of corporations away from long-term growth, significant research and development spending and limited returns on shares, and towards short-term profitability and rising dividends.

As Walden Bello put it, diminishing returns in key industries have led to capital being shifted from the real economy to “squeezing ‘value’ out of already created value in the financial sector. The result is essentially a game of global arbitrage, where capital moves from one financial market to another, seeking to turn a profit from the exploitation of the imperfections of globalized markets via arbitrage between interest-rate differentials, targeting gaps between nominal currency value and ‘real’ currency values, or short-selling in stocks, that is, borrowing shares to artificially inflate share values then selling. Not surprisingly [given the ascendency of finance],” he added, “volatility, being central to global finance, has become as well the driving force of the global capitalist system as a whole.”

The Rise of Neoliberalism

Many speakers said the intellectual legitimacy of financial liberalisation is rooted in neoliberal doctrines that have characterised mainstream economic thinking and policy practice since the 1980s-often referred to as the “Washington consensus.” According to French-based author and campaigner Susan George, socially-minded intellectuals and activists have underestimated the power of ideas in changing mainstream beliefs. “

Starting from a tiny embryo at the University of Chicago with the philosopher-economist Friedrich von Hayek and his students like Milton Friedman at its nucleus, the neoliberals and their funders have created a huge international network of foundations, institutes, research centres, publications,
scholars, writers and public relations hacks to develop, package and push their ideas and doctrine relentlessly...They have spent hundreds of millions of dollars, but the result has been worth every penny to them because they have made neoliberalism seem as if it were the natural and normal condition of humankind.”

The Original Bretton Woods

Kamal Malhotra was of the opinion that for the Bretton Woods institutions should return to their original mandate, as specialised arms of the United Nations, subordinate to specialised UN agencies concerned with human and social policy issues. The centre of gravity of global economic multilateral governance needs to be shifted away from the current relatively non-democratic and narrow finance and economics-centred institutions...to relatively more democratic and social and human development centred institutions such as those of the non-Bretton Woods United Nations system.”

The current “deep neoliberal indoctrination” of the Bretton Woods institutions, combined with the strength of financial interests and the “hegemonic influence within them of the United States,” as Walden argued, make them virtually impossible to reform. Irrespective of differences in political appreciation, most participants tended to agree on the following campaigning objectives:

- To halt current reform efforts in the IMF, as well as in other fora, to include capital account liberalisation in its Articles of Agreement, which would remove the flexibility needed for national governments to introduce capital controls as preventative measures against speculative attacks. (This point was echoed both in UNCTAD’s Trade and Development Report, 1998 and in the January 1999 report of the Task Force of the UN Executive Committee on Economic and Social Affairs. The report states that some developed countries have insistently pursued across-the-board capital account liberalisation in a number of fora, including the OECD, WTO and the Fund, although such measures are “contrary to their own historical experiences, which featured long periods of capital controls and only very gradual liberalisation of their capital account in recent decades.”)
- To “roll-back” the mission of the IMF back to its original mandate of financing short-term balance of payment problems without the right to impose long-term structural reforms on sovereign nations. Such reforms should be undertaken through national democratic processes
- To support the creation of democratically-managed and socially-oriented regional monetary funds to counter the power of what participants described as a de facto G-7 controlled IMF.
- To resist any intergovernmental attempt to “resurrect” possible variants of an OECD-type MAI, be it at regional level (for example, through a proposed transatlantic economic partnership), or global level (for example, through a “millennium round” of negotiations on “new issues” at the WTO). If an international agreement on investment were to be developed, it would have to be based on the principle of ensuring that transnational corporations abide by core human rights, labour and environmental standards, and ensuring the right of sovereign governments to selectively use “quality” foreign direct investment for the purposes of promoting sustainable development.

Unconditional Debt Cancellation by 2000

A number of participants at the meeting are part of the fast-growing international NGO Jubilee 2000 campaign, which is calling for debt cancellation by the year 2000. This was defined in a consensus text adopted at the
first Jubilee 2000 international conference in Rome on 17 November 1998 to include:

- unpayable debt, which is debt that cannot be serviced without placing a burden on impoverished people;
- debt that in real terms has already been paid;
- debt for improperly designed policies and projects;
- odious debt and debt incurred by repressive regimes.

The consensus text also says: “Creditor governments, international financial institutions and commercial banks, which are chiefly responsible for the debt crisis, should not set the conditions for debt cancellation. Civil society in the South must play a significant and influential role in a transparent and participatory process which will define and then monitor the use of resources released by debt [cancellation] for the benefit of the impoverished.”

This position was echoed in many discussions throughout the conference and was expressed by an unequivocal “rejection” of the G-7 endorsed Highly Indebted Poor Countries (HIPC) Initiative of the World Bank and the IMF.

Standstill and Orderly Debt Workout

Regarding the more recent generation of debt crises resulting from sudden and massive short-term capital outflows, many participants argued in favour of a proposal in UNCTAD’s *Trade and Development Report 1998* for an international standstill and orderly debt workout mechanism, derived from provisions contained in the US Bankruptcy Code.

Such a mechanism would enable a nation facing a currency attack to impose a unilateral standstill on debt servicing to ward off predatory investors and give the country the breathing space needed to design a debt reorganisation plan before a liquidity crisis turns into a solvency crisis. The standstill decision would then be submitted for approval to an independent panel rather than the IMF to avoid a conflict of interest with the Fund’s shareholders. Such a mechanism would avoid “inciting a panic” and be similar to provisions in the WTO allowing countries to take emergency measures.

According to John Dillon, such an alternative mechanism should amount to an “international insolvency tribunal” established through a treaty ratified by the United Nations. Its aims would include ensuring that “creditors bear their fair share of the losses that result from financial crises they themselves provoke through reckless lending [‘bailing in’ rather than ‘bailing out’ measures].” Another goal would be to allow debtor countries to access necessary credits at reasonable interest rates in order to pursue social and economic development. A third goal is to “to enable firms to remain in production instead of being squeezed into bankruptcy or becoming targets for takeover by transnational corporations” at highly discounted prices.

Several commentators said the desirability of an international bankruptcy code approach would depend heavily on the adjudicator’s de facto independence from the interests of creditors. Otherwise, such a mechanism could result in “even more creditor control and more negative conditionalities,” according to Yash Tandon from the International South Network.

Equitable International Taxation Systems

Numerous speakers, including representatives of the French-based NGO Association for the Taxation of Transactions to Aid Citizens (ATTAC), discussed the prospects and feasibility of international taxation
systems such as a “Tobin-type” tax on foreign exchange trading. A combination of equitable international taxation systems would serve several mutually reinforcing objectives:

- raise much-needed funds for social development in a context of dwindling overseas development assistance;
- contribute to reducing short-term speculative capital flows and financial instability (the original idea of US economist James Tobin who first proposed a small international tax on foreign currency transactions in the late 1970s);
- help reverse the increasing regressive character of national taxation systems (partly resulting from financial liberalisation), whereby the “exit option” enjoyed by highly mobile capital acts as a powerful disincentive to tax large financial players on an equitable basis.

Bruno Jetin from ATTAC said that although many arguments against a Tobin-type tax relate to the technical difficulties of its implementation, ATTAC’s position is that the primary obstacles are political. By way of comparison, he said the creation of a single European currency was technically much more complicated than would be the implementation of a Tobin tax, but the political will has been sufficient to make it a reality.

In addition to Tobin-type taxes, there were proposals made to levy taxes on transnational corporation sales on a pro-rata basis, and to develop international taxation agreements to create a “level playing field” enabling national governments to impose progressive taxes on corporations and financial conglomerates without facing capital flight.

National Growth Strategies through Equity

For many participants, national-level strategies were the most important elements for promoting people-centred development and “economic sovereignty in a globalizing world.” Seen in this light, the above proposals at the international level were viewed as most fundamentally aimed at regaining greater political and economic space at the national level to pursue alternative development paths that would primarily rely on, and serve to nurture, domestic resources and capabilities.

A recurring theme was to build upon development paradigms that go beyond narrow economic growth indicators, such as UNDP’s concept of sustainable human development. According to Kamal Malhotra, if economic policy is to be people-centred, that is, supporting sustainable human and social development goals, “then the objective should not be economic growth per se, or even growth with equity, but growth THROUGH equity.” In other words, national strategies would focus on enlarging local markets and stimulating domestic growth through comprehensive programmes of income and asset redistribution policies that would increase the “effective demand” (or real purchasing power) of the lesser-off majority of the population. In line with Keynesian principles, equity considerations are not treated as a “trade-off” against efficiency, or an “add-on” compensatory measure, but as a central element to make sustainable economic growth both possible and socially-cohesive.

The alternative models of economic growth were held by a number of participants to be not only people-centred but given the appropriate regulatory framework, environmentally sustainable as well.
Civil society, human rights and economic governance

Economic and political democracy were presented as inseparable by a number of speakers at the conference. The conference discussions made it clear that proposed policy tools such as capital controls are not ends in themselves but only parts (however indispensable) of a much wider people-centred development agenda. It was suggested that government and civil society roles and responsibilities should be framed within a common understanding and pursuit of the realisation of all human rights for all members of society. This would provide the most coherent existing ethical, political and legal basis for civil society groups to pursue what one participant described as the apparent conflicting objectives of effectively challenging the “authoritarian” roles and tendencies of governments, while simultaneously attempting to identify and strengthen the enabling and activist role of the state in the pursuit of social objectives.

Conclusion and follow-up

Participants felt this international conference broke new ground in providing a coherent and comprehensive civil society platform for people-centred economic reform agendas. While differences of opinion on what is feasible or desirable was reflective of the richness and diversity of participants’ inputs, the meeting did shed considerable light on the major political economic challenges and opportunities facing the international community at the turn of the century.

Participants agreed they would carry forward the analyses, proposals and campaigning positions emanating from the conference into their respective networks, and into various complementary events and processes in the coming months, including:

- the series of international civil society events before and during the 18-20 June 1999 G-8 annual meeting, including the Jubilee 2000 Global Week of Action on Debt and the Alternative Economic Summit in Cologne (Germany), on 16-19 June 1999;
- the build-up to the annual World Bank/IMF meeting in October 1999;
- the lead-up to the third WTO ministerial conference to be held in Seattle (United States) from 30 November-3 December 1999;
- preparations for, and planned civil society activities during, UNCTAD’s tenth quadrennial conference (UNCTAD X) to be held in Bangkok on 12-20 February 2000; and
- preparations for the UN five-year reviews of the Social Summit and the Beijing Fourth World Conference on

“...Look at it this way. We have the numbers on our side, because there are far more losers than winners in the neo-liberal game. We have ideas, whereas theirs are finally coming into question because of repeated crisis. What we lack, so far, is the organisation and the unity, which in this age of advanced technology we can overcome. The threat is clearly transnational so the response must also be transnational. Solidarity no longer means aid, or not just aid, but finding the hidden synergies in each other’s struggles so that our numerical force and the power of our ideas become overwhelming.”

-Susan George, author and campaigner, “A Short History of Neo-liberalism: Twenty Years of Elite Economics and Emerging Opportunities for Structural Change” Plenary I: Why Are We Having this Conference Now?, March 24
Women in mid-2000, as well as the late 2000 UN Millennium Assembly and Millennium NGO Forum.

In the concluding session on strategies and campaigns, several speakers stressed that, although international networking and participation in international events were crucial (for example, for campaign co-ordination purposes), the most critical political work must be carried out at the national level. It was emphasised that the political strength of the global civil society campaign against the MAI rested primarily on the active mobilisation of grassroots citizen coalitions and the parliamentary debates that these generated at the national level.

Indeed, a key element to democratising economic governance is to “democratise” people’s knowledge and understanding of complex economic and financial mechanisms and processes, and to “demystify” the political choices available to their elected representatives. This conference on “creating people-centred economics for the 21st century” was seen as a major contribution toward that goal.

The conference papers are available on the Focus on the Global South website http://www.focusweb.org

Throughout 1999, the debate and research on these issues continued. Focus staff were involved as speakers in events throughout the year contributing to the discussion on financial architecture, the international financial institutions, the role of the state, and the causes and effects of the Asian financial crisis.

These included:

*January*
Debate 21, Hanover

*May*
NGO Forum on Cambodia annual meeting in Phnom Penh

*June*
Parallel G7 meetings, Cologne
ATTAC conference, Paris

*August*
CUTS meeting on trade, Bangalore

*September*
Australian Council for Overseas Aid annual general meeting, Canberra
World Bank and IMF annual meetings, Washington

*October*
Debate 21, Bonn
INFID consultation on trade and finance in Jakarta

*November*
Jubilee South Summit, Johannesburg

*December*
*Entering the New Century: Global Contradictions and Alternatives* organised by the Institute of Comparative Political Studies of the Russian Academy of Sciences (ISPRAN), International Institute for Studies of Socio-Cultural and Political Problems (IISSPP) and Focus on the Global South, Moscow
UNCTAD NGO consultation, Geneva
FOCUS on the Global South

Food security

**Food Security Investigation in Indonesia.**

In co-operation with the Southeast Asia Council for Food Security and Fair Trade, Focus co-organized and participated in an investigation of the conditions of food security in Indonesia, in light of reports of starvation and severe malnutrition in the archipelago. Walden Bello, Li Kheng Poh and Marco Mezzera were part of a 16-member mission that visited several sites in Jakarta and then fanned out to other parts of the archipelago in late January and early February 1999. They focused on data gathering at the micro or community level through semi-structured interviews with the urban poor, farmers, small rural tradespeople, fisherfolk, government officials, various religious groups, non-governmental organizations, and relief organizations. The results of the mission were then published in May 1999 in a report entitled: *Manufacturing a Crisis: The Politics of Food Aid in Indonesia.*

Correlation of micro-data with macro-data yielded the main conclusions that the so-called “food crisis” stemmed from mistaken projections of rice output. These projections were then manipulated by certain forces within the country and used to consolidate their political position—with aid agencies acting as witting or unwitting accomplices.

The mission did not claim that economic conditions in Indonesia were not bad. They were. However, these conditions did not call for food aid. They called for economic policies that would provide jobs and income for people to enable them to eat consistently and have an adequate diet, and buy goods and services to meet their other needs. Aside from serving questionable political ends, food aid in the current Indonesian context, can only serve as a superficial solution to a larger structural problem.

According to the mission, this larger structural problem has two dimensions, short-term and long-term. In the short term, the crisis stems from the massive loss of confidence among foreign speculative investors. This has led to a hemorrhage of capital that has triggered the collapse of most of the country’s financial institutions and a great many of its corporations. However, this short-term crisis had its roots in a development model which has been imposed on the country over the last three decades by the Suharto dictatorship and the World Bank. The elements of this model, which had been unraveling in spectacular fashion since 1997, are:

- development based on foreign capital and foreign markets;
- an industry-based policy, or a strategy that subordinates agriculture to industrial priorities; and
- within agriculture, the implementation of a Green Revolution-based riziculture.

The mission asserted that agriculture was in trouble in Indonesia, but it was not a crisis that stemmed from drought. A huge dependence on fertilizers and other chemical inputs characteristic of Green Revolution technology have resulted in a fragile agrotechnology that can easily be unraveled by policy decisions such as the end of the fertilizer subsidy. Pushing rice as the staple crop at the expense of other crops, even in regions that formerly consumed non-rice staples, has created dietary dependence on a crop ill-suited to the climate and geography of those areas.
In sum, the mission concluded that Indonesia was not experiencing a classical crisis of hunger but a man-made economic collapse. In response to this crisis, the mission asserted that “What Indonesia needs urgently is not food aid but an end to the IMF restructuring program that has brought tremendous difficulties for many farmers, by cutting off the fertilizer subsidy. One cannot do this without first putting in place an alternative production strategy...What Indonesia needs in the short term is not food aid but an economic recovery program that brings down interest rates, cleans up the banking system, and puts people to work.”

In the longer term, the mission suggested that Indonesia undertake two major reforms: first, a fundamental reorientation of its agricultural technology away from the rice-intensive Green Revolution technology that has reduced diet diversity and bio-diversity and led to greater food insecurity in the face of climatic, technological, and economic changes; and second, the abandonment of the industry-first strategy in favor of a more balanced development paradigm that will make investment in agriculture attractive once more and, even more importantly, make agriculture “an occupation of which its practitioners can be proud.”

Preliminary Assessment Mission to East Timor

The idea of involving Focus in a fact-finding mission to East Timor, focussing on food security and agricultural policies, was first borne in the immediate aftermath of the 30 August referendum (where Marco Mezzera was present as an international observer, see below for details) and of the following three weeks period of destruction and devastation suffered by the East Timorese people.

At that time it became evident that a food catastrophe was on the verge of taking place. A spree of wild violence and mass deportation orchestrated by Indonesian military, with the reckless support of local militias, lead to a situation where almost 30% of the original population of East Timor either left the country, or was pushed into the bush.

According to the “United Nations Consolidated Inter-Agency Appeal for East Timor Crisis”, drafted to strategize the international relief operations for East Timor during a nine months period from October to June 2000, the potential “caseload” for the emergency assistance was calculated at 650,000 people. This amount included the approximately 150,000 persons, out of a total figure of about 250,000, who were spread around in camps in West Timor and who were expected to re-enter East Timor “if given the chance to voluntarily return”, and the more than 500,000 internally displaced persons (IDPs).

The preliminary assessment mission, which took place between November 14-22, was
conceived as a necessary step towards the later dispatch of a fact-finding mission on food security to East Timor by the Southeast Asia Council for Food Security and Fair Trade. Such a fact-finding mission had been conceived along the same lines as the one that the Council sent to Indonesia at the beginning of 1999 (see above). The declared objectives of the East Timor mission were to:

- assess the current food security situation of the people of East Timor and their most urgent alimentary needs
- assess the impact and efficiency of food relief activities carried out by international aid agencies
- determine the self-sufficiency prospects of the East Timorese people in terms of their future agricultural production

The preliminary assessment mission lasted for about eight days. Beside Focus’ staff member Marco Mezzera, the team included Ms. Chalida Tajaroensuk of Forum-Asia, and Professor James Ife, of the School of Social Work & Social Policy of the University of Western Australia and secretary of the Human Rights Commission of the International Federation of Social Workers. The team covered Dili and its surroundings, part of the Ermera district, and the territory between Baucau and Viqueque.

Global Governance Reform Project

The Alternative Security Program hosted the second meeting of the Global Governance Reform Project in Bangkok, between March 27-29, to discuss and critique the first draft of the various sections of the proposed book and the policy recommendations. The project is a joint effort of Focus (at that time represented by Kamal Malhotra, Ehito Kimura, and Marco Mezzera), La Trobe University in Australia and the Toda Institute in Hawaii. Its aim is to find ways to strengthen the role of the United Nations in managing global security and economic problems that both more centrally involve and are responsive to the needs of marginalized peoples and nations. During that meeting, among other things, it was agreed to produce two publications:

- A book composed of a part on peace and security issues (La Trobe University); a part on the democratization of global governance (Toda Institute); and a third part on the global governance of financial flows (Focus).
- A shorter version of this book. This document, of about 100 pages, is meant as the key instrument of the project for policy advocacy purposes and would focus on proposals for reform. In light of these objectives, it was agreed to have the shorter version ready by the time of the third meeting of the project, tentatively planned for the spring of 2000 in New York.

Focus at the Hague Appeal for Peace

With the aim of trying to address various issues central to the work of peace activists in both Europe and Asia, such as the role of US military power, arms trade, multilateral security strategies, and the Asia-Europe Meeting (ASEM) as an appropriate forum to raise security issues, Focus co-organized, together with three other organizations, a series of workshops at the Hague Appeal for Peace in May 1999. The other three organizations were the American Friends Service Committee (AFSC) through its Japan office; the Transnational Institute (TNI) from Amsterdam; and the European Network against Arms Trade (ENAAAT) also from Amsterdam.

The Hague Appeal for Peace was an international gathering of over 9,000 participants from 100 countries. More than 1,000 non-
governmental organizations (NGOs) and social movements groups were represented, and 400 separate programs took place over the four-day event. As such, the Hague Appeal presented an excellent opportunity to draw together peace activists, academics, and policy analysts from both Asia and Europe to take stock of current security problems and develop common strategies and alternatives.

The discussion of Asia-Europe alternative security strategies stretched across two days, five workshops, and one informal strategy session, bringing together representatives from South Korea, Japan, the Philippines, Malaysia, Singapore, Thailand, and various European countries.

The Focus representatives at the Hague Appeal for Peace (Walden Bello, Ehito Kimura, Marco Mezzera and Minar Pimple) took maximum advantage of the broad range of international security experts and peace activists present at that international event, by organizing or taking part in different informal meetings. One of these meetings became very functional to the planning and the organization in the following year of a South Asian conference on nuclear weapons.

Meeting on US bases in the Asia-Pacific

On June 26-27, Focus co-sponsored a meeting on the role and impact of US bases in the Asia-Pacific, in Seoul, Korea, together with Green Korea United and the National Campaign for Eradication of Crime by US Troops in Korea. The purpose of this meeting was to bring together representatives of the Asia-Pacific region to explore the possibility and frames of reference for a coordinated anti-bases movement.

The meeting had been conceived during the Second Annual Conference on Alternative Security in Asia Pacific held in Manila in July 1998, and in that sense was an initiative closely related to the Council on Alternative Security in Asia Pacific (CASAP). Some of the main proposals agreed on during the Seoul meeting included:

- Preparing initial analyses and materials explaining how the withdrawal of foreign military bases and the abrogation of access agreements will increase human security. Central to this initiative was thought to be a “phase in - phase out” study on military bases in the Asia-Pacific that would provide a framework for demilitarization in the region.
- A proposal for an Asia-Pacific working group to propose credible security alternatives that would replace the U.S.-Japanese dominated disorder.
- An outline of an integrated and coordinated campaign, including next steps in engaging still more national movements and organisations, calling for the immediate withdrawal of foreign military bases and the abrogation of access agreements.
- Implement a research project and campaign opposing the testing and use of Theatre Missile Defense (TMD) being set
up in Northeast Asia, to serve as one of the steps leading up to a region-wide campaign against its implementation.

- Promote regional campaigns to document crimes committed by foreign military forces, and to highlight environmental problems created by foreign military bases.
- Preparation of a CASAP Conference on Asia-Pacific security issues to be held in Okinawa during the G7 meeting in 2000.

Walden Bello, Ehito Kimura, and Marco Mezzera participated in this meeting on behalf of Focus.

Conference on Korea’s Reunification and ASEM Security Workshop

On behalf of Focus, Marco Mezzera participated on August 12-14 to an international conference for ending the cold war on the Korean peninsula and for a peace settlement between the two countries. During that conference, which was organized by the Korean National Congress for Reunification and which took place in Seoul, the Focus’ representative presented the CASAP’s proposal for a new security architecture in the Asia-Pacific and its possible role in the implementation phase of the proposal.

Immediately after the conference, a one-day workshop was held to discuss the most relevant security issues to be addressed in the work leading to the following NGO-ASEM forum to be held in Seoul as well in the year 2000. Among the other things, concrete proposals emerged from that meeting to study arms trade flows between Korea and Europe and to develop a better understanding of the concept of human security.

Monitoring the East Timor Popular Consultation

On behalf of Focus, and as a member of the international team put together for the occasion by the Asian Network for Free Elections (ANFREL), Marco Mezzera took part as an observer to the East Timor Popular Consultation of August 30. The actual mission took place between August 26 and September 2, when the eruption of widespread violence in the territory and a situation of total insecurity forced all the members of the monitoring mission to hastily leave the island. The abundant evidence collected by the various ANFREL observers of intimidation, close ties between the pro-autonomy militias and the Indonesian army and police force and attempts to disrupt the referendum process, became redundant as the situation plunged into complete chaos and destruction. The international community had to withdraw, and the East Timorese were therefore left to their cruel faith. Due to its direct witnessing of such an abominable human tragedy, however, Focus intensified its commitments and initiatives on behalf of an independent East Timor.
A Call to the International Community

Following the tragic events of the post-referendum in East Timor and its direct involvement in a mission monitoring the referendum in that troubled territory, Focus launched an international appeal in favour of:

- The immediate deployment of a UN peace-keeping force, with no restrictions on its humanitarian operations.
- The immediate withdrawal of Indonesian troops from East Timor and the dismantling of Indonesia-backed militia forces.
- The arrest and trial of those responsible for the massacres in East Timor for crimes against humanity.

In a couple of days Focus was able to collect more than one thousand signatures from all over the world. The text of the appeal, plus the complete list of all the signatories, was then published on September 14 in the English language Thai newspaper “The Nation”.

Planning Meeting on Nuclear Conference

Following the proposal of the July 1998 Conference on Alternative Security in Manila (see Annual Report 1998) to hold a South Asian-Southeast Asian Activists’ and Scholars’ Conference on Nuclear Weapons and Disarmament, on October 15-16, a planning meeting was organized in Dhaka, Bangladesh. The meeting was convened by Focus and the local partner Community Development Library (CDL). The agreed objectives of the meeting, which gathered about 25 people from eight Asian countries, were to decide on:

- The direction, objective, theme and hosts of the conference
- The date and place of the conference
- Logistics
- The organizing and steering committee, and the secretariat

Focus sent four representatives to the preparatory meeting, in order to help with logistics, and to make substantive contributions to the discussion and to the decision making process: Minar Pimple and Varsha Rajan from the India office, and Chirawatana Charoonpatarapong and Marco Mezzera from the Thailand office.
Micro-Macro Issues Linking Programme
Regional and Global

1. Mainland Southeast Asia

Efforts in 1999 to develop a region-wide programme in mainland Southeast Asia were successful. A number of possibilities for collaborative work in training and research with government and non-government organisations emerged in diverse areas such as food security, local economies, natural resources, debt, trade, etc. These possibilities have been discussed in the Focus 2000-2002 Workplan. Described below are the main activities that were undertaken in 1999 towards developing the foundation for a mainland Southeast Asia programme.

- Exploratory visits to Cambodia, Yunan and Vietnam: the main objectives of these visits were to develop understanding of the key development and policy issues in the countries, and to assess areas where Focus could make useful contributions. Jenina Joy Chavez-Malaluan and Shalmali Guttal met with a variety of people from government and civil society in these countries in order to share information about Focus’ work and learn about in-country issues and initiatives. In Vietnam, these visits were combined with short seminars at the National Institute of Science, Technology, Policy and Strategy Studies (NISTPASS) where Focus staff made presentations on issues such ASEAN and AFTA, globalisation and regional economic linkages.
Participation in conferences: Focus staff participated in and made presentations on a variety of subjects in conferences in the region, such as the role of Multilateral Development Banks in development (Vietnam), social, cultural and political aspects of water resources (Yunnan, PRC), gender based impacts of land titling (Lao PDR), linkages between domestic, regional and global economies (Lao PDR and Vietnam) and the political economy of natural resource use and conflicts in the region (Lao PDR, Vietnam and Thailand).

Research on the Greater Mekong Sub-region (GMS): The article, From ‘Flying Geese’ to ‘Cog and Wheel’: Some Issues on Sub-Regional Economic Zones, by Jenina Chavez-Malaluan was published by ARENA in the journal Asian Exchange. The article discusses different sub-regional groupings in Asia, their impacts on growth and development in the region, and the role played by the Asian Development Bank (ADB) in promoting such sub-regional arrangements.

Focus staff strengthened contacts with government and non-government agencies in Yunnan and Vietnam. These will be further developed into joint research and capacity building initiatives in the coming year.

2. South-South Exchange

Focus provided organisational and financial support for four persons from Thailand to visit the Narmada Valley in India. One of these persons is a reporter from the Bangkok Post, while three are activists from the Assembly for the Poor. When in India, they joined the rallies in the Narmada Valley and visited the Narmada Campaign Office. They also had extensive meetings with the Focus India team and discussed ways in which popular movements in Thailand and India could support each other.

Focus assisted in the peasant women meetings organised by La Via Campesina and Assembly for the Poor. Focus staff moderated sessions, made presentations of globalisation and also provided translation services between English, Thai and Lao language.

3. The World Commission on Dams

Focus started to work actively on the World Commission on Dams (WCD) since March, 1999. Focus was invited to join the WCD Forum, a loose reference group of peoples’ organisations, NGOs, research agencies, private companies and multilateral agencies who are expected to monitor the substance and quality of the WCD’s work.

Focus also joined the International Committee on Dams, Rivers and People (ICDRP) in 1999. The ICDRP is a network of peoples’ movements and NGOs committed to monitoring the use of water resources around the world, and advocating for peoples’ control over decisions about water use and management. The ICDRP has been particularly active in monitoring the work of the WCD.

During 1999, Focus acted as a peer reviewer to several studies undertaken by the WCD staff on economic and social impacts of large dams. Focus also worked with the Assembly of the Poor on tracking the study commissioned by the WCD on the Pak Mun, and with the Center for Water Policy in publicising the proceedings of the South Asia Public Hearing on large dams. Focus has been particularly critical of the quality of the WCD’s work—both content and process—in Southeast Asia, as well as in some of the thematic studies undertaken thus far. Focus will continue to engage with the WCD until it completes its work in the year 2000, although we will continue to maintain an independent, critical position.
4. SAPRI / SAPRIN

Kamal Malhotra took a leave of absence from Focus starting August 1999. Because of this, his responsibilities were distributed among the staff. This included work on the SAPRI/N, for which Focus acts as the Regional Center. The responsibility for SAPRI/N has been delegated to Walden Bello and Shalmali Guttal (Steering Committee) and Jenina Joy Chavez-Malaluan (Joy) (regional centre co-ordination and technical work).

In July 2-3, Joy joined the Philippine CASA Consultations and gave a workshop on the SAPRI Research and Fieldwork Investigation Framework and Methodology. She was also asked to join the Technical Team for the Philippine CASA. Later in the month (July 12-14), the Philippine CASA exercise had the National Launch, at which Walden Bello gave the keynote address.

As part of Focus’ regional responsibilities, Joy attended the Bangladesh SAPRI Research Workshop on August 30-31. She represented the regional centre as well as the SAPRI global secretariat during the workshop, where she stressed the importance and urgency of employing participatory methods and the political economy approach in the SAPRI exercise. In late September and early October, Joy, together with Dr. Philomena sta’Ana of the NGO Action Economic Research, attended the SAPRI Workshop on Economic Literacy and Alternatives Building in El Salvador organized by the Latin America Regional Center. Joy also spoke in a public forum on the global financial crisis

5. SCF-Focus Research: The Micro Impact of the Asian Crisis (Focus on Filipino Households and Children)

In line with Save the Children-UK Philippines’ desire to enter into more macro-level (in contrast to purely child-specific) advocacy, the group requested Focus to do a joint study of the impact of the East Asian financial crisis on Filipino households and children. Focus was responsible for the overall research process, but SCF-UK was actively involved in the development of the research design as well as in the micro stage of the research. The research employed various methodologies, some of which were used by Focus for the first time. Hence, aside from providing the opportunity to look into a timely issue, the research also made it possible for Focus to gain experience in different macro/micro research methods. The research was also a great opportunity for Focus to interact in a relevant way with various Filipino groups and individuals in and out of the NGO community.

Joy co-ordinated two contract researchers and a team of fieldworkers for the project, as well as took active part in the research design and writing of reports. Fieldwork was finished by end-November, and data processing, analysis, and writing was started in December. The draft integrative report was ready by February, after which it went the round for comments and final editing.

6. Other Global

Focus staff attended a conference on Cost-Benefit Analysis at Yale University in the United States in 1999. The primary purpose of the conference was to challenge current, dominant forms of economic valuations, and explore alternatives by which the values of diverse cultures and contexts can be adequately represented. Focus staff presented a paper on knowledge and power, and how they inform the domination of current valuation methods.

Focus staff attended the Jubilee South Summit in South Africa in November. The primary purpose of the Summit was to bring together activists working on debt at the
local, regional and international levels to formulate a common strategy for debt cancellation in the Third World. Focus made presentations in the Asia-Pacific Caucus and the international plenary sessions respectively on debt in Southeast Asia, and the Focus campaign to close down the IMF.

---

**Lao People's Democratic Republic (PDR)**

Programme activities in the Lao PDR maintained the direction set in 1998 and included collaboration with non-governmental organisations as well as government agencies. The majority of the work in 1999 focussed on capacity building, although strong possibilities for subsequent joint research also emerged.

### 1. Capacity Building with the National Economic Research Institute

A formal agreement was signed between the National Economic Research Institute (NERI) and Focus to train NERI staff in basic macroeconomic concepts and research methodology. Training activities in 1999 ranged from study tours to workshops on specific issues. Focus supported NERI’s participation in regional conferences such as the Focus conference on economic sovereignty held in March, 1999 (see above).

Focus also provided assistance to NERI in developing proposals for independent, small-scale studies and in organising lectures from visiting resource persons. For example, NERI and Focus jointly hosted a seminar on agricultural economic policy and food security in which Dr Peter Rosset presented his study on the sustainability of small farms. A short workshop on regional economic issues was organised by Jenina Joy Chavez-Malaluan, Focus staff from the Philippines.

As part of the ongoing collaboration between the two organisations, Focus has continued to facilitate information materials for NERI on research and development policy in both English and Lao. The main training activities were:

#### 1. Study Tour to the Philippines

Focus sponsored and facilitated a study visit for two senior level officials of the Institute. Ms. Sirivanh Konthaphane, Deputy Director, and Mr. Thanta Kongphaly, Head of the International Economics Division, visited the Philippines on 20-27 June 1999. The purpose of the study trip was to expose the NERI officials to how economic research and planning are done in the Philippines, as well as to familiarise them with how government, academe and civil society interact. They met with the Philippines’ socio-economic planning agency, the National Economic and Development Authority
(NEDA), to discuss the structure and operationalization of development plans, and public investment programming and monitoring. They also met with the NEDA’s research arm, the Philippine Institute for Development Studies (PIDS, NERI’s counterpart in the Philippines) and talked about mandates, operations and experiences in research and organisational growth. The two other government agencies they visited are the National Treasury and the Department of Agrarian Reform.

The visit exposed NERI officials to the interaction of the academe with government and civil society organisations. They met with professors from the National College of Public Administration and Governance, the Asian Studies Centre, and the School of Economics, all from the University of the Philippines. Among the NGOs they met were the NGO Forum on the Asian Development Bank, the Legal Rights Resource Centre (Friends of the Earth - Philippines), Action for Economic Reforms (AER), and staff from the Seattle-based APEX (Asia-Pacific Exchange).

The NERI team also participated in a forum on short-term capital flows sponsored by AER. Aside from the briefings, the visitors also obtained some very good materials and documents relevant to the issues they discussed during their stay.

2. Training in Macroeconomics, Policy and Research Methodology

The project agreement between Focus and NERI involves two sets of workshops (on macroeconomics and policy research methodology respectively) and guided practice/research by training participants. The first phase of the project, the workshop on Macroeconomics and Introduction to Research, took place on 6-16 December 1999 in Vientiane. A total of 20 participants from the NERI, the State Planning Committee Cabinet, the Department of Agriculture, the Bank of Lao, the Ministry of Finance, the Public Investment Program, the National Statistics Centre, and the Foreign Investment Management Committee, attended the intensive two-week training workshop. Dr. Joseph Lim of the University of the Philippines’ School of Economics served as the lead resource person and trainer in Macroeconomics. Jenina Joy Chavez-Malaluan handled the sessions on Introduction to Research.

2. Food Security

Following from previous activities in 1998, Dr Peter Rosset, Executive Director of the Institute for Food and Development Policy (Food First) and Mr Martin Bourque, Director of the Sustainable Agriculture Project at Food First visited the Lao PDR in November. The main purpose of the visit was to finalise arrangements for a feasibility study by a Cuban resource team on local production of organic agricultural inputs. It is now expected that two Cuban resource persons will arrive in the Lao PDR by late January-early February, 2000, and will work with staff from the Department of Agriculture for about six weeks. Focus assisted in planning and developing the above activity, and will continue to play a linking role between this and other related food security efforts. However implementation and management of the feasibility study will be handled by the Department of Agriculture and Food First, with support from Oxfam Solidarity (Belgium).

3. The Micro-Macro Network

The NGO Micro-Macro issues network was quite active in 1999, despite the heavy programme commitments of the network’s members. All in all, the network organised three short seminars and one longer workshop on the following issues:

May : The World Trade Organisation (WTO) and the Agreement on Agriculture
June: Impacts of the Asian crisis on the Lao economy
October: Agricultural policy and food security
November: The domestic economy in the Lao PDR

Resource persons in the above included government officials, international NGO staff and visiting resource persons. Focus played an advisory role in the seminars and was not directly involved in the organisation. Focus played a more significant role in the longer (three-day) workshop on the Lao domestic economy. The main objectives of the workshop were to assist participants to understand the particularities of the Lao economy and the implications of linkages between the domestic and regional economies. At the end of the workshop, participants discussed possibilities for setting up small, informal study groups on different aspects of the Lao economy and will explore this further in the coming year.

Thailand

Thailand is becoming directly engaged in policy-level dialogues with the multilateral financial institutions, namely the IMF, the World Bank and the Asian Development Bank through various Structural Adjustment Loans. In 1999, the two half-time staff members of the Thai program were monitoring the policies of these institutions and initiating links with academics, government officials and civil society at large to monitor, analyse and raise relevant policy issues concerning the proposed reforms for Thailand put forward by the government and the international institutions.

The regular features of micro-macro issues linking work of the Thai program in the forms of research, information dissemination and capacity building, with NGOs and grassroot organisations as the intended clientele, consequently revolved around structural adjustment policies. In particular the reform agenda in the social security, public health, education and agriculture sectors, which have direct effect on the poorer sectors of the Thai population whose welfare is dependent on government services and assistance, particularly in time of economic hardship the whole country was facing.

Research and Studies

A research study on the impact of the economic crisis on education in Thailand was carried out jointly by Chanida Chanyapate Bamford and Shalmali Guttal. Interviews were conducted with experts from the World Bank, the Asian Development Bank and UNESCO as well as Thai academics and high level officials of the Ministry of Education. Information on the effectiveness of the scholarship scheme came from the Foundation for Children’s Development which conducted a sample
survey through their field workers. A draft report was sent to Oxfam GB which used the information in their “Education Now” campaign.

Among the findings was that the ADB’s anti-corruption stance coupled with the Thai centralised bureaucracy’s chronic inefficiency and lack of targeting practice resulted in much delay in disbursement of scholarships and concentration of quotas in towns rather than the more needy remote areas. Apart from this one-time effort in alleviating the burden of the economic crisis on the poor, other ADB conditionalities concerning education sector reform are oriented towards reduced state and increased private sector participation in service provision. The ongoing issues involve cost recovery at the higher education level and policy options for the state’s financing obligation of 12 years of free education as stipulated in the new constitution.

As the purposes of this research are information dissemination and advocacy within Thailand and regionally, it is an on-going process. Two presentations have been made in public fora and a short article in Thai has been written on the topic.

The field-level research study planned for 1999: a follow-up on the state of the local economy of the Northern communities visited in 1998, has been postponed to 2000. Other research into alternative economics is proceeding slowly due to lack of staff time.

**Information Dissemination**

Focus is now contributing an article in Thai under the theme of “Economic Liberalisation and Thai Society” to the newly improved Prachathat Newsletter on a monthly basis. Thai Development Support Committee (TDSC) and the NGO Coordinating Committee have decided to develop the Newsletter into a full-fledged mouthpiece of the Thai NGO community with regular columns comprising Political Ecology, Alternative Agriculture, Bio-resources and Local Wisdom, Asia-Europe Dialogue on Alternative Political Strategies, and Economic Liberalisation and Thai Society, all contributed by the relevant NGO networks and organisations with an editorial by TDSC as an introduction.

Being a part of the Editorial Board of the Newsletter means that Focus’ contribution each month is dictated by the jointly-determined overall theme of the newsletter which in turn means that most articles have to be freshly written in Thai and not just translated from Focus’ electronic bulletin and entails documentary research and analysis of available materials on the chosen subjects. In all, 12 articles in Thai were published in the Newsletter ranging in subject from the gender dimensions in free trade, and the WTO and agriculture to the implications of public debt. In addition to this, an article by Ranee Hassarungsee was published in the Journal of Political Economy of Chulalongkorn University.

On the side of Focus’s own publications, two Thai versions of Focus Files were published and distributed to the NGOs by the Thai Program: a report by NGLS on the Economic Sovereignty Conference organised by Focus and an article by Alan Fowler on civil society.

**Capacity-Building Workshops and Seminars**

The Thai Program worked closely with the Regional and Global Paradigms Program to ensure that Thai NGO workers and members of grassroot organisations, namely the Assembly of the Poor, Integrated Women Workers’ group, Grassroot Women’s network and the Alternative Agriculture Network, participated and benefited from the various panel discussions during the three-
A panel on People-Centred Alternatives was organised particularly with this purpose in mind featuring and veteran activist on community currency from Mexico City, Luis Lopezllera. A special evening session with him was also organised specially for Thai participants during the conference. The Thai Community Currency System (TCCS) Project arranged a field visit to a Kud Chum community in the Northeast Region for him to meet with the villagers who had expressed interest in establishing their own community currency system.

As one clear people-centred economic alternative, the Thai Community Currency System Project in co-operation with Focus and Spirit in Education Movement (SEM) conducted another workshop for members of the Assembly of the Poor in Ubon Ratchathani Province in the Northeastern Region to familiarise them with the system and its potential contribution to the local economy. Meanwhile in Kud Chum District of Yasothon Province, a two-day problem analysis and planning workshop was organised by the TCCS project, with Dr. Uthai Dulayakasem, a consultant engaged by Focus, as key facilitator, to launch the communities on the path of formulating their own currency system.

A two-day micro-macro issues linking workshop for 25 field-level staff of the Catholic Council of Thailand for Development (CCTD) was conducted as planned with resource persons from Focus and the TCCS Project plus Dr. Kanoksak Kaewthep of the Centre of Political Economy, Chulalongkorn University, who acted as key resource person throughout the workshop. In the same manner of co-hosting and co-resourcing workshops and seminars, Kamal Malhotra and Chanida made presentations on the economic crisis and the role of the multilateral financial institutions at two other regional seminars of field-level NGOs and community leaders in Chiang Mai Province of the North and Khon Kaen Province of the Northeast respectively.

Towards the end of the year, the Thai Program together with the Paradigm Program organised a half-day round-table discussion entitled “The IMF, World Bank and WTO and Social Movements”. Representatives of the various sectors of the Thai civil society known to Focus were invited. The purpose was to present analyses of the current global issues and the concerns of international civil society and to examine ways and means for Thai NGOs, academics and social activists to work together in the area of national and international-level policy advocacy, particularly in relations to the imminent WTO ministerial
conference in Seattle and the upcoming UNCTAD conference in Bangkok in early 2000. Walden Bello and Nicola Bullard made presentations from Focus while Anuj Aphaphirom of Thailand Trend Monitoring Project and Nongnuj Singhadecha of Matichon newspaper made key contributions from the Thai side. The discussions ended with several organisations expressing commitment to pursue advocacy work on globalisation starting with the 10th UNCTAD conference.

The Working Group on Debt and Social Agenda

Common concerns on the social impact of the economic crisis and the perceived need to monitor the effectiveness of crisis alleviation programs implemented by the government with loans from the World Bank and the Asian Development Banks gave rise to the formulation of a Loan-Monitoring Working Group with CUSRI's Social Watch Project acting as secretariat. Other members comprised the Voice of the Disadvantaged Network, TDSC and Focus Thai Program on the NGO side and the Alternative Development Studies Program, the Social Development Studies Centre and CUSRI on the Chulalongkorn University side.

Apart from collecting and sharing information among members in a number of meetings, the group organised two one-day round-table discussions in February 1999. The first one in February entitled “The Social Agenda: Monitoring Crisis Impact Intervention” was attended by 30-40 representatives of all government agencies involved in the fast-disbursing Social Investment Program Loans and a number of NGOs working with women, children and the rural and urban poor. Problems in implementing the various programs were shared between the officials and the NGOs and the discussions were able to establish some common understanding and goodwill among the participants.

The second round-table in August, with the same combination of participants, was on the more complex issues of the World Bank and the ADB loan conditions regarding the reform of the public sector and social services. With the objectives of improving Thailand’s competitiveness through increasing its public sector efficiency, the policy matrices for health, education and social welfare sectors introduce the concepts of corporatization of public hospitals, cost-recovery of higher education and market-responsiveness to vocational education. The roundtable explored implications of these free market liberalism trends and raise questions concerning the division among the roles of the state, private sector and the local communities in social services provision and the need for the public to participate more in such policy debates.

The third roundtable in November was on the Thai social movement and the concept of civil society in this period of transition was aimed specifically at the NGOs and like-minded academics. Ranee presented a paper “A survey of the role of NGOs in civil society” and several discussants exchanged their views on strategies of engaging critically with the state and the market on the issues of social justice and development alternatives.

South-North Exchange

In co-operation with the Thai Community Currency System, Focus arranged for Dr. Kanoksak Kaewtheep of the Centre of Political Economy to attend a seminar on alternative currency systems project called “Barataria” which was being experimented with by European NGOs in 4 countries. Dr. Kanoksak later wrote an article in Thai introducing the concept of alternative currency and its rationale, which was published in the Journal of Political Economy.
1999 was the third full year of operation for the Focus India Programme. The priority areas for the year were the “NGOs and People’s organisations - dynamics and relationships” case study work, initiation of Focus’ South Asian regional security in the light of nuclear tests by India and Pakistan, and further development in the monitoring of Andhra Pradesh Economic Reform Programme. Focus Files in India was also launched.

I. Capacity Building Workshop on Multilateral Development Institutions

All together six capacity building workshops were conducted in 1999.

- Focus organised a Training of Trainers (TOT) workshop, taking advantage of Kamal Malhotra’s presence in India. Twenty-five participants from all over India took part, and the workshop was seen as a continuation and consolidation of the six workshops conducted in 1998.
- One day seminar on privatisation was conducted by Kamal Malhotra in collaboration with Centre for Environment Concerns (CEC), Hyderabad in which trade union leaders, researchers and NGOs took part. The aim of the workshop was to build the capacities of participants in the light of privatisation of power sector in Andhra Pradesh.
- Session on globalisation for students of Students Mobilisation Initiative for Learning through Exposure (SMILE) network.
- Half a day workshop for Donor Agencies Network (DAN) from western India on globalisation and challenges for funding organisations.
- One-day staff development workshop for Abhivyakti, Nasik was conducted on globalisation and social sector response.
- Capacity Building workshop for dalit activists from all over Maharashtra on impact of globalisation, liberalisation and privatisation on scheduled caste and tribe communities in collaboration with Samajik Nyaya Pratishthan (Social Justice Foundation) in which about sixty participants from different parts of Maharashtra participated.

Detailed reports of some of the above workshops are available in different languages. The workshop participants total 175 in all and came from diverse backgrounds, 20% were grassroots women groups, 40% were people’s movement activists, NGOs, academics and students were 40%. Over and above these capacity building workshops Focus staff made presentations at various fora.

- Kamal Malhotra spoke at Gandhi Peace Foundation on the changing accountability of NGOs in the emerging context of economic globalisation.
- Minar Pimple did a presentation for Community Aid Abroad, partners in South Asia on globalisation and emerging urban challenges.
- Presentation to YUVA staff on new economic policies and its impact and Focus’s response in India

This year we also undertook the preparatory activities for feminist economics workshop. On the basis of the Focus’s work in the last three years it was felt that the capacity building workshop on feminist economics be organised in collaboration with SAGE for activists and researchers from India. This programme is planned for January 2000.
II. Structural Adjustment Policy Review

Focus’s collaboration with CEC on Andhra Pradesh Economic Restructuring Programme (APERP): As part of our support for CEC’s work in monitoring the APERP, given its adverse impact on the living condition of the poor, Focus participated and supported the following activities.

CEC organised a two-day workshop on health sector reforms and Andhra Pradesh Economic Restructuring Programme. This workshop was attended by academics working on health related issues, health activists, doctors from both government and private sectors, health administrators, World Bank and government representatives. The workshop focused on implications of privatisation on public and preventive health and the immediate need of the improvement in government hospitals and health delivery systems.

Physical Infrastructure: Mr. Kamal Malhotra’s presentation on different mechanisms of privatisation and the merits and demerits of the Build Own Operate Transfer (BOOT) schemes (and their variations) was used in preparation of a paper “Infrastructure in Vision 20-20” by Dr Thimma Reddy of CEC.

Power Sector: Focus facilitated networking of CEC with the PRAYAS Energy Group based in Pune. This has led to joint work in monitoring power sector reforms in Andhra Pradesh.

CEC with support from Focus has also completed a book on Andhra Pradesh and the World Bank. This book will be of use to activists and researchers in Andhra Pradesh and in India. The part of this book will be developed as manual on multilateral development banks.

The collaboration with CEC this year has achieved new heights and with the launching of a three year APERP monitoring program from January 2000 there will be further consolidation of the work done so far.

III. Policy Oriented Research

Study on the impact of Durg District of Madhya Pradesh: This year the study was published as Focus Paper and is widely circulated among academicians and bureaucrats. Chatisgarh Mukti Morcha is extensively using the report, especially its women wing to articulate their vision of Chatisgarh State, which is being carved out of present Madhya Pradesh. Other social action groups in India are replicating the methodology used by the study.

Literature Review and Analysis on the Debate around Capital Account Convertibility and Capital Controls. This study was finalised and has been circulated widely to academicians and policy makers. It is proving to be a good tool for activists working against economic globalisation in India. In the year 2000 we plan to use this study for conducting seminars in different parts of India.

Critical Survey of Social Policies of India: This study focuses on poverty eradication strategies, urban development strategies and policies related to dalits, tribal, women, children and displaced persons. This survey also includes the critic of public health policies and policies in relation to elementary education. About 80% of work on this project is complete and the study is slated for publication in the later part of year 2000.

IV. Regional Security

In May 1998, India and Pakistan conducted the nuclear tests and joined the discrimina-
FOCUS on the Global South

It not only shocked the world, but also presented new challenges for the region as a whole especially for the peace activists. The development of a nuclear disarmament movement has been a major concern and the urgency for this effort has been further reiterated by the release of the Draft Indian Nuclear Doctrine.

In July 1998 during the conference on Alternative Security was held in Manila, organised by Focus on the Global South, an idea was floated to hold a conference on Security Concerns in the South Asia and Southeast region (also see Alternative Security Report, above, for details).

Since then the proposal had been discussed and debated at various levels and forums. The active participants and peace activists decided to hold a planning meeting for the same, to decide upon the final shape, objectives and form of the conference.

The planning meeting was successfully held on the 15th - 16th October 1999 in Dhaka, hosted by Community Development Library and organised by Focus on the Global South. The region was well represented in the meeting.

Following the planning meeting the organisation in collaboration with the Steering Committee members and CDL got down to the task of organising the main event to be held on the 18th - 20th February 2000, Dhaka, Bangladesh. In the last quarter of the year, energies were spent in preparing for the same. Focus India Programme acted as the secretariat for the conference. For the successful organisation of the conference we spent the third quarter in approaching various civil society organisations, peace activists, individuals, trade unionists, cultural bodies, academics to actively participate in the Nuclear Disarmament Conference and make the event a success.

V. Publications

The year saw the initiation and introduction of the layout and the design of the Focus Files. In 1999 India Programme came out with two issues in September-October and November-December. The Files were effectively used to disseminate information on subjects of current importance and spread the message of peace by announcing the South Asia and Southeast Asia Peace Activists’ Conference on Nuclear Disarmament. Other than this following documents were prepared:

- Article on Indian Agriculture, Farmer’s Rights in WTO
- Critic of World Bank and Resettlement Policy Draft.
- Micro-Macro strategy paper for India programme. (Draft)

VI. Consultative process on Alliance Building

This year finally we have been able to complete this process in collaboration with the National Campaign Committee for Rural Workers (NCCRW) which was initiated with following objectives.

- To participate in the process of alliance building amongst voluntary organisations and the broader people’s movement (that includes participation of trade unions within social movements) for social change in the country.
- To understand the existing relationship and nature of dynamics between voluntary organisations and people’s movements.
- To understand factors promoting or inhibiting positive relationships, cooperation, partnerships between the two, opening up spaces for alliances.
- To develop a dynamic framework for appropriate relationship, institutional arrangements, mechanisms, key values
and principles with the objective of strengthening relationships between voluntary organisations and people’s movements.

This year we completed the process documentation of NCCRW, highlighting its alliance building potential as well as areas of weakness, co-operation of core group of NCCRW has been very good. The consolidated report including the case studies of other organisations will be finalised in early 2000. This report will be circulated to all participants followed by a national consultation to finalise it, to cull out recommendation and to develop follow-up action plan.

**Other Initiatives**

Focus India was represented at various meetings of National Alliance of Peoples’ Movements (NAPM), NCCRW, People’s Global Action conference in Bangalore, CUTS meeting in Bangalore, and a presentation to the Self Employed Women’s Association (SEWA) on Focus’ India programme. Internationally, Minar Pimple participated in the Focus conference on Economic Sovereignty in Bangkok, the training programme on international finance which followed, the Hague Appeal for Peace, Netherlands, and WTO related events in Seattle.

Focus India Advisory Committee met once to review the 1998 work report and to finalise 1999 work programme with three year perspective plan.

**Conclusion**

Year 1999 has witnessed expansion of the programme and opening new frontiers for South Asia regional work. Focus Files is becoming an important vehicle of communication for Focus. Year 2000 presents a challenge for building advocacy on important micro economic issues in India as well as to establish Focus as an independent entity.
Organisation Management and Development
The New Year started at full speed with the Focus administrative staff heavily involved in preparations for the March conference on economic sovereignty. Every conference has complex logistics, and this was compounded by twice the anticipated number of participants and unavoidable staff shortages. However, the comments from participants in the earlier section of this report prove that the administrative staff managed to organise all the details, from photocopying to reimbursements, to food and travel arrangements, with patience, good humour and efficiency.

Apart from the enormous organisational and administrative tasks associated with the major conference in March 1999, the year will also be remembered as one of evaluations and planning. In May 1999, Focus asked two external evaluators to review Focus’ successes and failures, strengths and weakness, and opportunities and challenges, to assist in our own reflections and planning for the three year 2000-2002 work plan.

Dr. Philomeno sta’Ana from Action for Economic Reforms, Philippines and Dr. Kanjana Kaewthep of Chulalongkorn University, Thailand, took up the task. We were very fortunate to have such insightful and committed evaluators, who through a process of interviewing, reading and discussion prepared an evaluation report which has been the basis for much of our own discussions and planning. We would like to acknowledge their excellent work. The report was sent to all our funders, and we are happy to share this with other interested organisations.
In addition, we were also reviewed by NOVIB as part of the normal rota of partner reviews. Again, we were blessed with intelligent and sympathetic evaluators, Lisa Jordan from the Bank Information Centre in Washington DC and Lori Udall, from the First Nations Development Institute, also from the US. Again the evaluators — through interviews with Focus staff, partners and target groups — produced a helpful report and many of the specific recommendations have been incorporated into our workplans and management structures.

There was a three-day workshop for all staff in late May. At this stage we were aware that Kamal Malhotra would leave Focus in September, so this was an important occasion to benefit from Kamal’s experiences of five years in establishing and being a co-director, as well as involving him in the process of planning the three-year workplan. Many issues were discussed in the course of the retreat, from programmes to salaries. Not everything was resolved however we do see the organisation as a ‘work in progress’ which evolves and adapts to meet new challenges and priorities.

Staff changes

There were several significant staff changes in 1999. Kamal Malhotra, a founding co-director, left in September for the UNDP in New York. He remains as a member of the Board.

Ehito Kimura, who was with Focus for two and a half years and was instrumental in establishing the alternative security programme, left also in September for graduate studies in the US.

Li Kheng Poh, who first started work at Focus researching the shrimp-turtle dispute, and then went on to co-ordinate the establishment and first year of the Southeast Asia Food Security and Fair trade Council, also left in late 1999. She returned to Malaysia and will be starting graduate studies in 2000.

Two new staff joined Focus in 1999: Marissa de Guzman, who is Walden’s assistant in the Philippines, and Varsha Rajan Berry, who is based in the Mumbai office. We welcome them.

Soontaree Nakaviroj, office manager, gave birth to her second child, a son, in September and Thidarath Kanishthanaka filled the post with great competence for three months.

We also advertised for a Senior Associate and a Communications and Resources Manager and hope to fill both positions in the first quarter of 2000.

Focus Board

The full Focus Board meeting was held in June, however the December Executive Committee meeting was re-scheduled to February due to pressing demands on everyone’s time. There were few changes in
the Board: Noeleen Heyzer from UNIFEM resigned due to mounting commitments, and it was agreed that Kamal Malhotra should join the Board in his new position at the UNDP. The Board was also saddened to hear that Dr Renato Constantino Snr, who had been an adviser to Focus since its beginnings, passed away after a long illness in Manila.

**Board members 1999**

Charles Abugre, ISODEC  
Dr Gothom Arya, (Chair of Focus Board) National Electoral Commission, Thailand  
Dr Leonor Briones, National Treasurer, Philippines  
Josefa Francisco, Development Alternatives for Women in the New Era (DAWN), Philippines  
Muto Ichiyo, Peoples’ Plan for the 21st Century, Japan  
Sara Larrain, Renace, Chile  
Mikyung Lee, Member of the National Assembly, South Korea  
Dr Amara Pongsapich, Director, Chulalongkorn University Social Research Institute, Thailand  
Rajagopal P.V., Ekta Parishad, India  

**Advisers**

Dr Victor Karunan, Save the Children Fund UK, Thailand  
Dr Martin Khor, Third World Network, Malaysia

**Fellows**

Dr Peter Rosset, Institute for Food and Development Policy, USA

**Co-Directors**

Dr Walden Bello  
Kamal Malhotra

**Staff**

Aileen Kwa  
Chanida Chanyapate Bamford  
Chirawatana Charoonpatarapong  
Jenina Joy Chavez-Malaluan  
Marco Mezzera

Joy, Soontaree, (back row), Chirawatana (Jim) and Mayuree (Nok) in the middle and Walden in the front. Focus office in Bangkok.
Publications & Resources
Throughout 1999 Focus has produced numerous publications, including books, reports, Focus Files and Focus Papers as well as the monthly electronic bulletins Focus on Trade and Focus on Security. The subscription list for Focus on Trade exceeds 2,500 while Focus on Security has a highly targeted audience of 200. These bulletins are Focus’ main vehicle for mass communication of our writing, and the material is usually written by Focus staff and partners. The most powerful feature of the electronic bulletin is their immediacy, which we try to use to full effect.

In addition, papers and articles by Focus staff or as a result of events organised by Focus have appeared in numerous other publications. Some of the outstanding papers presented at the Second Annual Conference on Alternative Security in Asia Pacific (Manila 1998) appeared in the Peace Review, September 1999, and the paper ‘Building An Iron Cage: The Bretton Woods Institutions, The WTO, and the South’, was included in the excellent selection of essays View from the South: The Effects of Globalization and the WTO on Third World Countries published by the International Forum on Globalisation for the WTO meeting in Seattle, November 1999.

Our website has been constantly updated. In late 1999 we advertised for a Communications and Resources Manager, and this post will be filled in the first quarter of 2000. Upgrading and expanding our information technology capabilities is a priority for the year ahead.

The Focus India Programme is now publishing its own issue of Focus Files, with two issues in 1999. (see India report for details.) A number of articles were written by Focus staff in Thai for local publication, and many others were translated into Thai.

The major Thai publication for 1999 was, however, the Thai edition of A Siamese Tragedy: Development and Disintegration in Modern Thailand by Walden Bello, Shea Cunningham and Li Kheng Poh. It was launched on 21 April, 1999 at Thai House, Chulalongkorn University with hundreds of distinguished guests from the business, private and government sectors, non-government organisations, academics and of course many friends. The book was widely reviewed in the Thai press and in the months following there was a second and third printing. We would like to extend our heartfelt thanks and congratulations to the translator Suranuch Tongsila and the publisher Komol Kheemthong Foundation.
Bangkok Office

Focus on Trade

January 1999

- *Brazil’s Wooing Of Speculative Capital Misguided: An Interview with Cristovam Buarque*, Walden Bello
- *The True Alternatives, But Is Anyone Listening?* Chanida Chanyapate
- *Humility and Hubris: The Bretton Woods Twins Fail To Disarm the Critics*, Kamal Malhotra
- *Rethinking Asia - What Sank Asia? Bad Journalism And Sloppy Analysis By Investors, Brokers And Academics Were Among The Causes*, Walden Bello
- *Governments Begin To Stake Out Positions as New Negotiations on Agriculture Approach*, Walden Bello
- *WTO Food Politics: Food Security through Liberalised Trade or The Nurturing of Domestic Production?* Aileen Kwa
- *Towards Food Security: A Position Paper for Developing Countries in the Review of the WTO Agreement on Agriculture?* Aileen Kwa
- *Summaries of the Analysis and Information Exchange (AIE) Papers Submitted to the WTO Committee on Agriculture?* Aileen Kwa
- *WTO and Developing Countries: Foreign Policy in Focus Brief*, Aileen Kwa

April 1999

- *Architectural Blueprints, Development Models, And Political Strategies*, Walden Bello
- *A Meeting Of Minds: Interview With Hazel Henderson And Walden Bello*, Sanitsuda Ekachai and Atiya Achakulwisut, Bangkok Post April 3, 1999
- *The WTO and Developing Countries: Will Vietnam Benefit from Being A WTO Member?*, Aileen Kwa, (Paper presented at the Workshop ‘WTO and Developing Countries’, organised by the International Economic Integration Unit of Vietnam’s Ministry of Foreign Affairs, and sponsored by Oxfam (GB), March 5 1999)

June 1999

- *The Politics of Food Aid in Indonesia*, Southeast Asia Fair Trade and Food Security Council
- *Will the WTO Ever Be the Same?* Nicola Bullard

July 1999

- *G7 Tightens Its Grip on Global Economy*, Nicola Bullard
- *Asia, Asian Farmers, and the WTO*, Walden Bello
- *Will Food Security get trampled as the Elephants Fight Over Agriculture?* Aileen Kwa
- *Structural Adjustment Review a Lesson in ‘Constructive Engagement’, Kamal Malhotra

August 1999

- *A New Trade Round: To Have Or Have Not?, Aileen Kwa
- *Power, Timidity, And Irresponsibility in Global Finance*, Walden Bello
- **Deconstructing Larry: What The New Man At Treasury Has In Store For Asia**, Walden Bello

**September 1999**
- **A New Paradigm for Rights Based Advocacy Strengthening NGO Alliances in the Post-Suharto Era**, Emmy Hafild
- **Capital Flows and Global Instability: How the Neo-Liberals Helped Fuel the Fire in East Timor**, Nicola Bullard
- **From APEC to Ashes**, Marissa de Guzman & Walden Bello

**October 1999**
- **Trick or Treat: The New Sugar-Coated IMF**, Nicola Bullard
- **Jubilee as Social-Movement Model**, Patrick Bond
- **China at 50: A View from the South**, Walden Bello

**November 1999**
- **NGO's Take on WTO in the Battle of Seattle**, Walden Bello
- **Searching For Scapegoats: Who'll be Blamed if Seattle Talks Fail?**, Nicola Bullard
- **WTO and Developing Countries: Updated Edition of Foreign Policy in Focus Brief on the WTO** also published in Foreign Policy In Focus, Vol. 4, No. 35, December 1999, Interhemispheric Resource Centre and Institute for Policy Studies and in the book: ‘Global Focus: US Foreign Policy at the Turn of the Millennium’, ed. Tom Barry and Martha Honey, St Martins Press, February 2000, Aileen Kwa
- **Confusion and Chaos in the Countdown to Seattle**, Aileen Kwa
- **The Iron Cage: The WTO, the Bretton Woods Institutions, and the South**, also published as Focus Papers, Walden Bello
- **Clare Short Prescribes Bitter Medicine for Developing Countries**, Focus on Trade in Seattle: Special Issue # 1, Aileen Kwa

**December 1999**
- **State of Emergency in Trade Talks for Developing Countries as Majors Exert Political and Economic Pressure**, Focus on Trade in Seattle: Special Issue #2, Aileen Kwa
- **A Blow-By-Blow Account of Friday, 3 December**, Walden Bello
- **From Crisis to Victory for Developing Countries**, Aileen Kwa
- **What Next for Asia and the WTO?**, Walden Bello

**Others**
- **An Overview of Key Millennium and Long-term Objectives Facing East Asia in the New Millennium**, panel presentation on “Overview of Medium and Long-Term Regional Objectives” for World Bank Regional Meeting on Social Issues Arising from the East Asia Economic Crisis and Policy Implications for the Future, UN Convention Centre, Bangkok, Thailand, 21-22 January 1999, Kamal Malhotra
- **ASEAN has But One Option on East Timor**, The Nation, September 10, 1999, Walden Bello
- **Basic Health Services for Vulnerable Families in Vietnam: Should Use Fees be the Way Forward?** paper was prepared for the International Save the Children Alliance and UNICEF in Vietnam. A first draft of this paper was prepared in October 1998 and it was finalised in May 1999, Kamal Malhotra
Can the Bretton Woods Twins Abandon Their Reason for Being and Should They? paper prepared for the Questioning the Growth Model Roundtable meeting, Terschelling Island, The Netherlands, 8-10 March 1999, Kamal Malhotra

CARE International’s Vision for the 21st Century: Key Issues and Major Challenges, for CARE International Workshop, Hua Hin, Thailand, 20 April 1999, Kamal Malhotra

Civil Society Organisations in the New Millennium and Their Potential Roles and Prospects for Enhancing Sustainable Social and Human Development, paper prepared in February 1999 for publication in the 1999 annual issue of the journal PEACE FORUM of the Graduate Institute of Peace Studies, Kyung Hee University, Republic of Korea. The title of this issue of the journal is “A Social Paradigm for the New Millennium: Role and Prospect of a Civil Society”, Kamal Malhotra

Development Enabler or Disabler? The Role of the State in Southeast Asia, paper for the Institute of Southeast Asian Studies (ISEAS) workshop on “Embedding Capitalism in Newer Asian Contexts: Authority Structures and Local Cultures and Identities in Southeast Asia”, Singapore, 22-23 March 1999, Kamal Malhotra


Economic Reforms and the Poor: A Study from Madhya Pradesh, India, Focus Papers, October 1999, Praveen Jha, Manjusha S. and Dipankar Mitra

Emerging Containment Policy, Bangkok Post, June 1, 1999, Ehito Kimura


Fuelling the psychology of the bubble economy, The Nation, February 9, 1999, Walden Bello

Globalisation and the Economic Growth Paradigm: Some Implications for Labour Migration and Mobility, paper for the Asia & Pacific Migration Journal, June 1999, Kamal Malhotra

It’s The Development Model, Stupid! The Nation, March 24, 1999, Walden Bello


Memory Lapse lets the Market Reign Unchallenged, The Nation, July 12, 1999, Nicola Bullard

New Directions for Economic and Social Policy or Business as Usual? paper presented for World Bank Regional Meeting on Social Issues Arising from the East Asia Economic Crisis and Policy Implications for the Future, UN Convention Centre, Bangkok, Thailand, 21-22 January 1999, Kamal Malhotra

NGOs Without Aid: Beyond the Global Soup Kitchen, a paper prepared for the panel discussion on NGOs in a Future Without Aid at the conference “NGOs in a Global Future”, University of Birmingham, United Kingdom, 10-13 January 1999, Kamal Malhotra


Renewing the Governance of the Global Economy, paper prepared for Focus on the Global South conference. “Economic


The Debate on Capital Account Convertibility: Theoretical Issues and Policy Options, Focus Papers, June 1999, Sumangala Damodaran

The Perils of Privatisation, The Nation, March 12, 1999, Walden Bello

The WTO and Asian Farmers: Are They Winners or Losers? paper prepared for the Conference of the Nation Multi-Media Group, Bangkok, Thailand, 29 July 1999, Kamal Malhotra

Timor deserves peace at last, Bangkok Post, February 3, 1999, Walden Bello


Why We Need an International Campaign against the International Monetary Fund, A draft discussion paper by Focus on the Global South


Economic Integration in the ASEAN: In Need of A Miracle, Asian Exchange Vol. 13, No, 2, ARENA Press, Jenina Joy Chavez-Malaluan

From ‘Flying Geese’ to ‘Cog and Wheel’: Some Issues on Sub-Regional Economic Zones, Asian Exchange, ARENA Press, Jenina Joy Chavez-Malaluan


Mumbai Office

Critic of World Bank and Resettlement Policy, Draft.

Indian Agriculture, Farmer’s Rights in WTO Micro-Macro strategy paper for India programme, Draft

Manila Office

### Comparison of Revenue, Expenses and Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Budget**</th>
<th>Exp.Actual</th>
<th>Revenue</th>
<th>Rev.over Exp.</th>
<th>Opening Balance</th>
<th>Closing Balance</th>
<th>Variance from Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Management &amp; Administration</td>
<td>91,646.00</td>
<td>76,557.94</td>
<td>72,870.76</td>
<td>-3,687.18</td>
<td>6,819.38</td>
<td>3,132.19</td>
<td>15,088.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Micro-Macro Programme - India</td>
<td>67,429.00</td>
<td>47,669.71</td>
<td>41,766.08</td>
<td>-5,903.63</td>
<td>512.02</td>
<td>-5,391.61</td>
<td>19,759.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Micro-Macro Programme - Laos</td>
<td>42,815.00</td>
<td>32,109.41</td>
<td>25,741.87</td>
<td>-6,367.54</td>
<td>4,122.06</td>
<td>-2,245.48</td>
<td>10,705.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Micro-Macro Programme - Thailand</td>
<td>54,592.00</td>
<td>46,457.57</td>
<td>35,152.93</td>
<td>-11,304.64</td>
<td>9,430.21</td>
<td>-1,874.43</td>
<td>8,134.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Micro-Macro Programme - Regional/Global</td>
<td>78,049.00</td>
<td>77,311.44</td>
<td>57,989.35</td>
<td>-19,322.09</td>
<td>2,984.91</td>
<td>-16,337.18</td>
<td>737.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paradigms Programme - Trade &amp; Investment</td>
<td>93,895.00</td>
<td>59,807.09</td>
<td>67,355.01</td>
<td>7,547.93</td>
<td>5,690.63</td>
<td>13,288.55</td>
<td>34,087.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paradigms Programme - Security</td>
<td>42,773.00</td>
<td>44,422.99</td>
<td>55,238.81</td>
<td>10,815.82</td>
<td>3,151.09</td>
<td>13,966.91</td>
<td>-1,649.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paradigms Programme - NICs</td>
<td>7,028.00</td>
<td>3,495.21</td>
<td>2,500.00</td>
<td>-995.21</td>
<td>1,378.47</td>
<td>383.27</td>
<td>3,532.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paradigm Programme - Cultural responses</td>
<td>26,484.00</td>
<td>10,109.29</td>
<td>8,089.29</td>
<td>-2,020.00</td>
<td>2,711.32</td>
<td>691.32</td>
<td>16,374.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paradigm Programme - Democratization &amp; Development</td>
<td>22,286.00</td>
<td>17,319.48</td>
<td>14,848.12</td>
<td>-2,471.36</td>
<td>3,158.56</td>
<td>687.19</td>
<td>4,966.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paradigm Programme - NGOs Accountabilities</td>
<td>7,869.00</td>
<td>7,983.20</td>
<td>5,570.34</td>
<td>-2,412.86</td>
<td>3,234.25</td>
<td>821.39</td>
<td>-114.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publications and Resources Center</td>
<td>48,385.00</td>
<td>37,476.12</td>
<td>35,413.78</td>
<td>-2,062.35</td>
<td>3,391.52</td>
<td>1,329.17</td>
<td>10,908.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub Total</strong></td>
<td>583,251.00</td>
<td>460,719.44</td>
<td>422,536.33</td>
<td>-38,183.12</td>
<td>46,584.41</td>
<td>8,401.30</td>
<td>122,531.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference related expenses</td>
<td>187,750.00</td>
<td>146,019.43</td>
<td>159,077.47</td>
<td>13,058.05</td>
<td>41,730.57</td>
<td>54,104.97</td>
<td>80,098.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security workshops</td>
<td>75,000.00</td>
<td>19,107.89</td>
<td>6,197.16</td>
<td>-12,910.74</td>
<td>55,892.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diff.on exchange '98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-11,601.70</td>
<td>-11,601.70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Fee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,954.35</td>
<td>1,954.35</td>
<td>3,621.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6,734.60</td>
<td>6,734.60</td>
<td>12,599.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3,353.67</td>
<td>3,353.67</td>
<td>6,734.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carry forward from 1995-1997</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>181,642.05</td>
<td>181,642.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjust Closing balance 1997</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20,055.56</td>
<td>20,055.56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M&amp;M-Rev.-RBF grant for '2000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>80,098.16</td>
<td>80,098.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>846,001.00</td>
<td>625,846.76</td>
<td>679,951.73</td>
<td>54,104.97</td>
<td>244,488.79</td>
<td>298,448.45</td>
<td>220,154.24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Did not include workshop expenses USD. 12,910.74, it's under Security workshop items at below
** 1 USD = 36 BHT. (same rate as Work Plan'99)
*** Did not include India & Philippines funds direct through their country.

**Amount in USD**
We would also like to thank the following organisations for supporting the conference:
Economic Sovereignty in a Globalising World:

Action Aid (UK), Asia Partnership for Human Development (Thailand), CAFOD (UK),
Canada Fund (Thailand), Christian Aid (UK),
Heinrich Boll Foundation (Germany), Indo Pacific Investment (Thailand), Japan Volunteer Centre (Japan), Nautilus Institute and the Quantum Leap Project (USA), Preamble Centre (USA), Trocaire (Republic of Ireland), World Vision (Thailand).