

ADRIAN LOVETT

UNDP Forum, Paris

Wednesday 19 January 2005

It's a great honour to be here and humbling to speak alongside such distinguished colleagues.

I've been here since Monday morning and I've listened to the presentations and discussions with great interest. I've been stimulated and challenged.

From Amartya Sen on Monday we heard the plea to ask the right question: namely, why "a massive command over resources, knowledge and technology go hand in hand with the rugged presence of extraordinary deprivation and staggering inequality." With Nancy Birdsall yesterday we contemplated the donor world's "seven deadly sins". The first, I think, was impatience. I'd like to confess my own status as a sinner and borrow that one this morning.

Because today we look ahead to the next ten years. Ten years is either a very long time or a very short time, depending on your perspective. I remember when I worked for a member of parliament in the British House of Commons. As you know, British parliamentary conventions can be arcane. My boss had been in the job for a few months when he confessed to an older colleague that he still found the place a little confusing. 'Don't worry', the veteran parliamentarian said, "the first ten years are the worst".

More recently I helped to lead Jubilee 2000, the campaign to cancel the debts of the poorest countries. There we had a self-imposed deadline that grew ever closer. Decision makers used to become exasperated as we insisted that a breakthrough could not wait for the next G8 summit, or the next General Assembly. And yet, to their credit, sometimes those decision makers grasped the sense of urgency. When President Clinton decided in late 1999 to go the extra mile and cancel not 80 per cent, or 90 per cent, but 100 per cent of the bilateral debts owed to the United States—to actually wipe it out—the announcement surprised even many of his own advisers. I remember talking

to a senior British government official soon after, and asking her to follow suit. "No Adrian, you don't understand," she said. "There are technical problems. There are legal problems. We can't do it." "I understand that", I said, "but we want you to do it." "NO ADRIAN," she repeated, "we can't do it." Three weeks later, they did it.

That's the tension inherent in the subjects we are discussing. The quality of understanding, analysis and thought within this room today is immeasurable. And without it we would be so much the poorer. It gives us hope, it shows us that we have the solutions, that if we find the political will and the resources, we can change the world. And I would bet that for virtually everyone in this room, the idea that we might help change the world is why began to do what we do.

Because action without thought and understanding is irresponsible. But thought and understanding without action is unforgivable. Unforgivable when we know the urgency. When we reclaim those statistics as the people they truly are. The lost security and dignity of an African family in dire poverty—among the quarter of a billion more living on less than a dollar a day by 2015 if we do not act. The lost life chances of a child—one of the 97 million who will still be out of school in 2015 if we do not act. The lost lives of the unluckiest children—among the 45 million more who will die before 2015 if we do not act.

We know the figures. 30,000 children die every day because of the effect of poverty. One child every three seconds. Imagine if that were here. In Paris. Or Berlin. London. Or New York. Another child every three seconds. If we had the power. How long would we wait? Before we said .Stop.

We don't have ten years. What we must remember about the Millennium Development Goals—one of the great things about them—is that they are outcome-focused. BY 2015, we want children in school—so we must start paying for it now. By 2015, we want to halve poverty—so we must support families in developing decent and sustainable livelihoods now. By 2015, we

want to reverse the spread of AIDS—so we must make life-saving action possible now.

It's this sense of urgency—coupled with a belief that 2005 presents a unique opportunity—that drives the Global Call to Action against Poverty, the emerging alliance of national coalitions that are coming together to work for a breakthrough against poverty and injustice in 2005. In September last year, I joined delegates from more than 80 countries in Johannesburg as the Global Call was born. It will be launched next week at the World Social Forum in Porto Alegre.

This coalition is not fundamentalist. It is pragmatic and real. But it holds passionately some deep beliefs and assumptions which, I admit, sometimes jar a little with the prevailing tone at international conferences on development. But we should not feel too reticent in saying:

- that the target of halving poverty by 2015 is not only achievable, it is perhaps a little modest;
- that free trade and fair trade are not the same thing and free trade does not always offer the best solution in developing countries;
- that the Common Agricultural Policy as currently constructed is incompatible with Europe's claim to be a friend of the world's poorest people;
- that rich countries—in the past four decades—have become half as generous while becoming twice as rich—and that's a record of shame;
- that Germany, on current trends, will reach the 0.7 per cent aid target by the year 2087—and that's unacceptable;
- that seventy in every hundred United States aid dollars are paid to United States companies—and that's not pro-poor;
- that while countries like Zambia see life expectancy fall to 33 years and lose half the teachers they train every year to AIDS, the Global Fund

for AIDS has only a quarter of what it needs in 2005—and that's a scandal;

- that the \$29 billion debt relief deal for Iraq—agreed by France, Britain, the US and others—is worth more than the total amount cancelled for 27 countries in the entire lifetime of the HIPC initiative—and that shows what the world can do when it really wants to act.

On Monday we were talking about identity. The different identities held by the people mobilized in this Global Call in 2005 are many and varied. Mothers and brothers, teachers and workers, faith leaders and academics, artists and businesspeople, campaigners and celebrities. Just like Jubilee 2000, that prompted Bill Clinton to comment: "I know a big tent when I see one"—this coalition defies the normal boundaries of ideology, geography and culture.

And national coalitions are in place across the world. Here in France, more than thirty organizations have formed a coalition under the name "*Plus d'excuses!*" Strong organizations—some represented here today - are in the driving seat - Agir ici, CCFD, the trade union CFDT, Coordination Sud, CRID, Secours Catholique.

The coalition is launching with a greeting card already signed by about 20 celebrities such as Youssou N'dour, Didier Deschamps, Manu Dibango and Patrice Leconte. The card will be handed over to President Chirac to ask him to take action. There'll be events throughout the next few months and the coalition will also gear up for a mass mobilization in early July, when large numbers of citizens will wear the global symbol of the campaign on white band day.

In Germany, a coalition has formed, led by the NGO umbrella VENRO. In the last few weeks, among other things, they've placed an influential advertisement in national papers—supported by Claudia Schiffer, Herbert

Grunmeyer and others. Its the first in a series of ads and events which give a very German identity to the coalition there.

And in the UK, we think this is going to be the biggest coalition ever formed for a campaign like this. It hasn't come out of nowhere. It's built on some big networks. The Trade Justice Movement. The Jubilee Debt Campaign. The Stop AIDS Campaign. And BOND, the huge network of organisations focused on global poverty and injustice.

The coalition is made up of more than 150 organisations. Together those members already have 4.6 million supporters.

In Britain we're finding that the incredible surge of public support after the tsunami is in many cases being translated to a wider concern about poverty and injustice. We started the year in unusual style—on 1 January a special episode of the Vicar of Dibley, the BBC's top comedy, featured the main character—a woman vicar in a small English village—urging her congregation to make 2005 a year to make poverty history. 12 million people, one in every five people in Britain, were watching. The moving final scene of the programme triggered wide public support including from a number of genuine women vicars—so last week I witnessed the strange sight of 350 real women vicars joining with the actor who plays one fictional woman vicar marching on Downing Street to lobby the real British prime minister. Modern campaigning is a surreal business.

The UK coalition will keep growing. Already the 800 shops run by Oxfam around the country, which are selling this symbol of the campaign, the white band—have been inundated with requests. Next month, Nelson Mandela will come to London in support of the campaign and will personally lobby the G7 finance ministers meeting there. As leaders fly in for the G8 summit in Scotland in July, we'll have huge numbers gathering in Edinburgh to make their presence felt.

What changes does this global coalition want to see?

We want to make poverty a thing of the past, and we believe it can be done. But we won't succeed if we tackle only one part of the problem. The **injustice of current trade rules**, the **burden of debt** and the poor **quality and quantity of aid** all need to be fixed. We don't think this is a menu where you can pick and choose. You have to be serious about the whole package and I want to say a quick word about each part.

On **trade**, there's a story from Christian Aid that sums it up well. In Sunyani, Ghana, Agatha Yumbia struggles to support her family by selling chickens. She can no longer sell her chickens because she can't compete with the cheap subsidised chickens imported from Holland and Canada. And while those European and North American products are heavily subsidised, Ghana's government can't do anything to stop those imports, or to protect small farmers like Agatha, because the IMF and the World Bank don't allow it. We have to end those rich country subsidies that leave the world's poorest farmers on the edge of survival. We have to ensure that elected governments in poor countries have the power to act in the interests of their own people—to make trade part of the solution to overcoming poverty, not part of the problem. And we have to accept that given the choice, those governments will not always follow a prescription of free trade and market liberalisation. Let's have trade rules and practices that are biased—**IN FAVOUR OF** people living in poverty. That's trade justice.

**Debt:** This is the unfinished business of the 20th century. In the debt crisis, we see both the incredible potential for progress in the fight against poverty **AND** the risk of shameful failure. From the \$100 billion in debt cancellation promised six years ago at the G8 in Cologne, \$40 billion has now been delivered—and I could take you to schools that no longer charge fees and clinics that now have medicines across Africa as a result. Because, of debt cancellation and more aid, Ugandans no longer have to pay for basic health care—and as a result, attendance at clinics is up by 50 to 100 per cent and immunisations have doubled.

But still, ten out of fourteen countries that have been through the debt relief process are still spending more on servicing their debt than on the health of their people. In a continent shell-shocked by HIV/AIDS, that has to change— BUT IT WON'T change unless we go further on debt. There a proposal on the table to cancel 100 per cent of multilateral debts, along with bilateral. This has to be done. We need leading countries to embrace with this approach and it will take diplomatic muscle to persuade them.

And that leaves **aid**. We need more of it and we need it to work better. It will work better if it is focused much more on the poorest countries and supports the priorities identified by those countries, their parliaments and their people. It will work better if it doesn't come with externally-imposed economic policy conditions, or tied to buying goods and services in donor countries. It will work better if it is predictable and sustained over the medium and long term. And of course it will work better if there is more of it. Much more.

In Britain, there's a lot of pride that the country now has—at last—a firm timetable to reach the agreed aid target of 0.7 per cent of national income. There was genuine and widespread delight—a reaction not often associated with us in the NGO world—at the UK government's announcement last year to increase annual aid by more than a billion dollars. It was great news. In some ways it's even more exciting that last week, the main opposition Conservative party declared that it would maintain that increase if it were in power. Not long ago in Britain we had a bipartisan consensus to speak as little as possible about aid spending in the confidence that no-one within the UK was particularly interested. Now we have a beauty contest between parties who recognize not only that this is the right thing to do, but that there are votes in it too.

And to focus the efforts of decision makers and to make an immediate impact, we believe rich countries must agree AT LEAST an extra \$50 billion each year, starting in 2005. We believe that without it, the Millennium Development Goals will never be achieved, any benefits from progress on trade and debt will be undermined, and those who pay the highest price will be the poorest, the sickest, the youngest, the forgotten, the vulnerable, the excluded.

So the global call to action against poverty wants to see trade justice, an end to the debt crisis, and more and better aid—along with strong and determined action by developing country governments as their part of the bargain. It won't be easy and we'll need public support on an unprecedented scale. For me, the prize goes well beyond those policy changes. Our goal over the next decade—this development decade—should be the transformation of public opinion in Europe, North America, Japan and beyond.

We know that even the most enlightened decision makers act within the limits of their political climate. I believe success will only come if people in rich countries view poor people on the other side of the world as if we were all, say, occupants of the same train carriage. It isn't that everyone should necessarily know everyone else and be great friends. It is simply that we know we inhabit the same space. That if some people are experiencing deep pain and hardship, it is impossible for others to ignore it. That wide inequality between rich and poor is not something that either side can ultimately live with.

So, in conclusion, I believe our campaigns for change will be sustained and achieved over the next ten years in four ways:

First, we must be broad and inclusive in our coalition-building, refusing to be pushed to the margins but instead going to the heartland of public opinion and building from there—broad coalitions rooted in clear, strong values that bring people together, across boundaries of every kind.

Second, we must connect people and the decision makers that are accountable to them more firmly and more often—whether through email campaigns, town hall events, media coverage or high level lobbying.

Third, we must be innovative—think differently about how we communicate and recognize that when we speak to the public and decision makers about poverty and injustice we are competing for their attention with a thousand

other issues - and we must not be above getting stuck in and explaining our case in a way that will cut through the noise around us.

And fourth, we must maintain a focus on the issues that we know add up to the solution—including trade justice, dropping the debt, more and better aid, national government policies that put the fight against poverty first—and we must hold ourselves and others accountable not merely for warm words but for concrete action.

As we remember that child every three seconds, we must welcome changes of rhetoric but not let them become our measure of success. We must engage in dialogue but not allow it to degenerate into a talking shop. We must celebrate great technical solutions but never let them be celebrated while they lie unused on their creators' desk. We must appreciate small steps forward but only when they are part of a much greater arc of certain progress. We must manage our impatience—but never forget that we are impatient because of our passion for justice, and we are passionate for justice because of our humanity.

Thank you.