

## **Workshops und events: Thematic Clusters**

AEPF11 is structured to encourage discussion, sharing and the development and articulation of alternatives. It has three phases:

### **1. Contexts and Analysis:**

The Plenaries (day 1, morning) will be the time for Context and Analysis where we can discuss unifying threads and discuss our understanding of the processes that produce and replicate inequality, poverty, exclusion, injustices, rights violations, or climate change/global warming. We will look at issues linking and across themes.

The First Set of events/workshops is for the introduction into each of the seven themes, for this the format could be a panel discussion, inputs by speakers, etc.

### **2. Lessons Learned, Successes and Failure:**

The Second Set of events/workshops is for deepening of our seven themes. Here we can discuss the contexts, problems and key barriers to taking our agendas forward and the responses and strategies developed by movements and civil society organisations to respond to them.

### **3. Strategies for People's Visions and Future Perspectives:**

Here, we can develop alternatives, our People's Visions. This is where the processes for how to get there, how we progress towards them are presented. These again correspond to our themes and that have been the focus for discussions in the first two phases.

A moderated Plenary where a summary of each of the Thematic Clusters' proposals for Strategies for People's Visions will be shared with all participants.

### **Open Space:**

Besides these events, organised by Working Groups for each thematic cluster, there will be space for self-organised workshops. These **Open Space** workshops could be related to the seven themes, but also taking up issues and debates independent of those.

**Note: Last minute changes are always possible – and to be expected! Venues will be Government Palace and National University, rooms will be announced later**

## **Thematic Cluster: Resource Justice, Land Rights, Equal access to Water, and Participation - Going beyond Extractivism**

*“Buy land, they are not making it anymore” (Mark Twain)*

### **Background**

For consumer goods like smartphones, laptops, cars, etc. we need raw materials. Industries, especially in Europe and in East Asia, but also in South and Southeast Asia, are using every year more copper, nickel or tin. Most of the producing countries have to import most of these raw materials from other regions and countries. The consumer and industry still ask for more. Same with agrarian raw materials. Thus land grabbing for mining, industrialised agriculture and many other purposes like urbanisation and tourism is increasing, including water grabbing as well.

At the same time we observe an increased concentration of only a few multinational companies providing these raw materials. And the North just exports its mines to the South. Some of the countries in Asia and Europe are called “resource rich”. But this wealth is often not a chance but a curse. The extraction of raw materials is often associated with massive violation of human rights, social rights, workers rights, indigenous rights and the degradation of the environment. There is a huge lack of transparency and involvement of local and affected communities. The host governments are often not willing or not able to secure the rights of local people. The promised benefits of employment opportunities and economic development bypass local communities and even national governments might not gain by increasing revenues or foreign exchange. Critical civil society, social movements and journalists are threatened or even killed if they report about social and environment problems. Multinational companies avoid paying taxes, circumvent national and international regulations and sue countries when governments implement higher social or environmental standards.

### **Thematic Event 1 (phase 1): Mining in different regions**

Mongolia’s mining boom is an example for the development paradigm of extractivism. It was prepared and launched by development donor institutions “inspired” by so-called investors and led by the World Bank and IMF country strategies for restructuring and liberalizing policies. Government’s attempts to merge a socio-developmental narrative with a neoliberal policy framework aimed at attracting large foreign mining investors has been successful but the actual implementation process of the socio-developmental provisions follow a particular strategy by the government whereby these provisions are being implemented only sporadically. This „selective absence“ of the state is resulting in political instability and has led factions of recent governments to promote measures that are viewed by the investors as feeding “resource nationalism”. Since 2013 the current elected government has embarked on the road of hectically amending national laws on land, pasture, water and environmental protection to „further improve investor friendly environment“. All laws, donor or development programs lead to ensuring more land freed up for extractive industry exploration and mining activities.

Restructuring and legal reform of this kind do not happen only in Mongolia. Mining activities in many other 'resource rich' Asian countries and in Europe, especially in Eastern Europe, with a longer history provide plenty of illustrative material about experiences at the economic, political, social and environmental level. Too, the reference to developments and discussions in Latin America could contribute to the understanding of development impacts, strategies of actors like companies, governments and financial institutions, framing the activities of social movements and CSOs.

With speakers from Philippines, Mongolia, and Romania.

### **Thematic Event 2 (phase 1): Land grab for crops, mining, development**

Land and water are two of the main fundamentals for the livelihood of millions of families negatively affected by commercial, industrialised exploitation of natural resources. In the past few years 'land grabbing' has reached threatening proportions with the increasing competition from powerful companies from this mining sector, from agribusiness, and from various other profit-seeking activities like financial and urban land speculation or tourism for increasingly scarce land and water resources.

Land grabbing for Oil palm, Banana and Maize cultivation for example is one of the major threat to the forest in Asia, which produce many non-carbon benefits including food to the local communities and capture CO<sub>2</sub> to cool the planet. 90 per cent of the palm oil to Europe comes from Indonesia, Malaysia. The Asian region supplies 25 per cent of the banana market in Europe, with the Philippines as the second largest Banana exporter after Ecuador.

However, corporations grab the forest and agricultural lands with the support of corrupt officials and the politicians. They displace local communities and criminalize the communities and leaders. There are plenty of human rights violations in those locations. They apply huge amount of harmful agrochemicals with grave impacts on the health of local people and the environment. They pump out river water and the ground water in large scale. They find cheap labour from poor communities who lose their territories.

Equal access to Water: Mega mining projects operated in the Gobi Desert region of Mongolia plan to transfer water from rivers in the north to the south. Three mega dams proposed in Selenge River basin will impact a Ramsar Convention protected wetland and a World Heritage site in Russia causing tension between Russia, Mongolia and China (which will finance the construction with \$1.0 B). A least three local communities will be completely resettled, lose pasture as well cropland. Thousands of hectares of forest will be cut to make space for the dams and infrastructure. The studies are and were financed by development banks.

With the dispossession of land, forests and water, local communities loose the possibilities for self determined, economic viable and sustainable approaches towards their own development aspirations. Shrinking spaces for such alternatives lead into a vicious circle of forcing more and more people into the neoliberal development model with precarious livelihoods as low paid workers, migrants, and underemployed in the informal sectors of the economy. With speakers from Indonesia, Philippines, Mongolia, Cambodia, and Sri Lanka

### **Thematic Event 3 (phase 2): Lessons Learned**

Win some, loose some! But how to change the game? – International civil society and social movements in the field of raw materials

*Discussing resistance movements and learning from each other – what kind of tactics do work in different contexts?*

Governments in Asia and Europe are pursuing policies that foster foreign investments, pushing for free trade agreements, bilateral investment treaties and other contracts. Yet those treaties and agreements favour the mining and agro industry. At the same time, people in Asia and Europe start to organize and protest against such treaties and practices. But a lot of these voices and protests are still isolated. There is a lack of sharing knowledge and experiences, stories of success and failures of our struggles. People miss opportunities to learn from each other.

The workshop will give the opportunity to exchange and discuss about (inter-)national struggles against resource extraction and their associated costs against the background of the discussions at the two workshops of phase 1 and phase 2. What have been failures and successes of past activities by civil society and social movements? We want to discuss which campaigns, lobbying, civil disobedience, demonstrations, media work, drafting of bills / laws, and publications, etc. were successful and which were not. And more importantly: why did they prove to be successful and what were the reasons they failed to achieve the desired outcomes? What can we learn from those past activities to inspire, inform and shape current strategies and tactics? Finding common ground where we might even be able to support each other.

#### **Guiding questions:**

*Are there positive examples to learn from? What resistance movements do exist in the EU and Asia who do successful work against impacts of extractivism, the influence of IFI on extractivism processes, how these processes being monitored by civil society, etc.?*

Inputs (5 - 8 minutes) by participants from Mongolia, Philippines, Romania, Malaysia, and Germany

### **Thematic Event 4: Strategising**

#### **What next? Designing common strategies towards resource justice**

In this workshop we will discuss how to use this international network of civil society organisations & academics for supporting each other's work and advancing common strategies towards resource justice. We will formulate concrete ideas and define next steps.

Moderator: Karin Küblbock, Austria, and Michael Reckordt, Germany

**Main question for this workshop:** How can we use this international network of civil society organisations & academics for supporting each other's work and advancing common strategies towards global, national, local resource justice? What are concrete next steps?

The Workshop will be a mix of short introduction, group discussions, and sharing ideas about next steps.

**NOTE:** The Thematic Cluster '**Resource Justice, Land Rights, Equal access to Water, and Participation - Going beyond Extractivism**' is being coordinated by OT Watch (Mongolia), Center for Environmental Justice/Friends of the Earth-South Asia, (Sri Lanka), and Stiftung Asienhaus (Germany)

## **Thematic cluster: Food Sovereignty - “Corporate Invasion to Food Sector”**

### **Background**

Asia region is crucial to European economic interests. The EU has already established its footprint in Asia with an ambitious agreement with South Korea; an ASEAN strategy based on individual agreements as building blocks towards a region-to-region EU-ASEAN framework; FTA negotiations with Japan; and on-going investment negotiations with China and Myanmar. This Asia strategy will need to be pursued, consolidated and enriched over the next few years.

In southeast Asia, following the agreement with Singapore, the conclusion of negotiations with Vietnam has set a second benchmark for engaging with other partners. The EU remains committed to resuming negotiations with Malaysia and Thailand also to conclude the investment negotiations with Myanmar. EU will also to open FTA negotiations with the Philippines and Indonesia.

In 2015, EU released a new strategy on “Trade for All” that EU has a new approach on Trade and Investment strategy in order to boost economic growth. Of course, by encouraging the expansion of exports and investment in the partner country, particularly in the agricultural sector. Another new approach One of the aims of the EU is to ensure that economic growth goes hand in hand with social justice, respect for human rights, high labour and environmental standards, and health and safety protection.

This new approach must should be criticized given the EU is the country of origin of the many TNCs that operating in developing countries. In fact, sometimes they are doing human rights abuses in carrying out its business activities. For example, The FTA between Indonesia and the European Union will increase an aggressive investment coming from the European Union in the agricultural sector especially related to the EU renewable energy policy. The EU’s policy is indicated to escalate the farmland deprivation and marginalization of small-holder farmers in their role as food producers.

Therefore, the Food Sovereignty Working Group will explore 3 sub-themes:

### **The Problem:**

- a. Exposing the New approach on “EU Trade for All “, especially in food and agricultural sector, and an outlook of EU Economic Partnership with Asian Countries.
- b. Corporates invasion in food and agricultural in Asian Countries and Human Rights abuses to the People.

The emergence of a new approach to Asia, which is called "*EU Trade for All*" is a symptom of the increasingly massive invasion of multinational corporations in the European free trade agreements with Asian countries. To the experience of some Asian countries, such as Indonesia, invasion of corporations have lead to the diminishing access of peasants to land, criminalization of the peasants, and so on. This invasion may become a serious threat to the sustainability of food sovereignty of Asian countries and increase human rights abuses by

corporation. Serious policy measures are necessary to take to ensure food sovereignty in Asia and eliminate human rights violations by corporations.

### **Lessons Learned:** *Reclaiming Peoples' Rights – in Asia & Europe*

The extent of the impact of multinational corporation invasion over the globe has been resisted by various sectors. Peoples' Tribunal against Monsanto was a civil society advocacy experience that we can refer to the fight against corporate crime. The demands for wage increase by workers, agrarian reform by peasants, access to cheaper health services, as well as the call to bring multinational corporate violating human rights accountable are responses towards the invasion of multinational corporations.

The experiences of Asian and European countries on the success and challenges faced by their community in claiming back their rights that have been deprived by the actions of some corporation needs to be revisited. The evaluation and learning from the success or defeat can be a model for people's resistance in different parts of our world.

### **Strategy**

The practices of human rights abuses by corporation seem to be untouchable by the law. Legal enforcement by the State against corporate for their bad business practices is toothless. Even more, the influence of corporations in legal and political systems is damaging the role of the State to protect human rights. In its development, the application of the UN's Guiding Principles is still far from what is expected. This is because the Guiding Principles is considered to be blunt in law enforcement on cases of human rights abuses by corporations.

The emergence of the *UN Resolution 26/9* concerning the need to create a binding international instrument on Business and Human Rights for accountability of multinational corporations, might be an effective instrument in law enforcement against corporations. Binding Treaty on Business and Human Rights would be an effective remedy mechanism followed by strict and binding sanctions.

To that end, Binding Treaty could be an alternative strategy to restore the rights of people who have been deprived by the actions of corporation. So that it is necessary for civil society to advance a concrete offer concerning the form and content of a Treaty that could effectively answer the issues of food sovereignty in the world.

### **Speakers: tbc**

Sandeep Chachra, India

Hayu Dyah Patria, Indonesia

Sit Tsui, Hong Kong,

Anisur Rahman, Bangladesh,

Timmis Sundman, Finland

Maja Magnusson, FIAN Sweden

Kirk Barlow, China

Roy Anunciacion, Peoples Coalition for Food Sovereignty, Philippines

Urantsooj Gombosuren, People's Coalition for Food Sovereignty, Mongolia

**Note:** The Thematic Cluster '**Food Sovereignty - Beyond Zero Hunger**' is being coordinated by Food Coalition/CHRD (Mongolia), Indonesia Global Justice (IGJ), and the Finnish AEPF Committee.

## **Thematic Cluster:**

### **Climate Justice and Transformation of Energy Systems**

The climate crisis has already reached the level of a planetary emergency. At nearly one-degree Celsius increase of the global average temperature since pre-industrialization, it is already causing massive loss, destruction and destabilization of ecosystems and communities all over the world but most especially in the South. This is why climate change is not just a matter of ecological destruction, but also a social justice concern.

In the 2009 COP15 in Copenhagen, climate justice movements called for urgent actions that would keep temperature rise to below one degree Celsius. Many scientists are now saying that this is no longer physically possible. However, there is still a chance to stabilize the earth's temperature to below 1.5 degrees Celsius, but this will require huge changes in the way societies produce and consume goods and very high emission reduction targets must be achieved in the short term.

The Paris Climate Agreement forged last December 2015 stipulates this 1.5 degrees Celsius limit as the aspirational goal of all parties to the agreement. This is being hailed as an important achievement – as indeed this is the most ambitious goal ever agreed to by governments. However, the concrete mitigation targets submitted by governments that form a major part of the Paris Agreement fall very short of this 1.5 degree goal. The collective impact of these national targets condemns the world to a 3-degree rise in global temperatures.

More than ever, addressing climate change urgently requires peoples organisations and movements to intensify, scale up and escalate all efforts for a comprehensive transformation of the global capitalist system which gave rise to this crisis. Such efforts must also aim for concrete short term and medium term positive changes. What the world will do in the next 5 to 12 years will determine whether the 1.5 degree limit will still be possible, whether we will still have a chance to prevent climate catastrophe.

A crucial sector where major changes should take place immediately and where complete transformation should be done in the soonest possible time is Energy. While addressing energy poverty, which is a prerequisite for a better quality of life, especially in Asia, we should also build alternative energy sources that will ensure future transition to a post-petrol future where energy is accessible, sustainable and clean and more importantly democratically owned.

Many communities and movements in Asia and in Europe are fighting long-standing battles to stop dirty energy and harmful projects. Many of these initiatives are confronting how wealth is being produced in the world-economy and bringing the question of social and economic justice on the agenda. Others are engaged in resisting privatization and corporatization of energy services and fighting for people's right to energy. Increasingly, movements across these energy issues are uniting around the demand for the transition to renewable, efficient and democratic energy alternatives for people and communities. This must be done as swiftly as possible and in a just manner that ensures that workers and communities are not displaced and dislocated. Studies indicate that if we are to keep temperature rise to below 1.5 or even 2 degrees – there is just a fixed amount of carbon the world can still emit, which requires that most of the current fossil fuel reserves should be kept in the ground.

A dangerous response to the climate crisis is the promotion of false solutions. At the same time, opportunistic and profit oriented projects are being introduced to address energy poverty. The danger stems from the following: 1) These solutions do not represent real or reliable results; 2) These solution become an excuse or a substitute for taking real effective actions; 3) these solutions carry other dangers and other harmful impacts on people and the environment; and 4) these solutions exacerbate inequality and make it possible for elites and corporations to gain profit from climate change and its impacts.

The sessions on Climate and Energy Cluster at the AEPF11 will involve an exchange of information, analysis and perspectives on the Climate Crisis and transformation of Energy Systems.

There will be three sessions.

### **Session One: Thematic Plenary on Climate Change and Energy**

We will present what is the current state of play in the climate front and the requirements for stabilizing the earth's temperature at the safest level still possible - below 1.5 degrees. How do we understand energy? What is the current energy situation in Asia and Europe? How do we understand the current energy crisis and what are the implications of current climate targets in the long-term need for transformation of energy systems?

With speakers from Philippines, UK, Australia, and Mongolia

### **Session Two: Saving Our Future: Lessons from our Victories and Current Limitations**

With inputs from Belgium, Mongolia, India, and Indonesia

### **Session Three: Strategy Meeting**

Sharing and discussion on what social movements and networks from Europe, Asia and Mongolia are doing to advance climate justice and energy transformation – resisting dirty energy and breaking free from fossil fuels, opposing false solutions, working for swift and just transition to renewable energy systems for communities and people. Exploring and developing concrete joint strategies and strengthening joint actions.

The first part will be presentations of some campaigns and the strategies adopted:

With contributions from Germany, Belgium ....

**Note:** The Thematic Cluster '**Climate Justice and Transformative Energy Systems**' is being coordinated by Rivers Without Boundaries (Mongolia), Asian People's Movement on Debt and Development, Indian Social Action Forum (INSAF), and Transnational Institute (The Netherlands).

## **Thematic Cluster: Trade and investment**

### **Background**

The aim of the sessions is to show the relevance and enhance the knowledge of the current trade and investment framework by a) showing the wider context of the trade and investment regime; b) signalling and explaining the risks and dangers in the trade agenda; c) highlighting the growing unease with the current trade and investment framework and the calls for reform, both from active civil society campaigns and from governments primarily in the global South, and pulling all of this global, abstract critique into the Mongolian context by highlighting concrete cases; and e) providing angles for further action and collaboration among all civil society actors present.

The session should also sketch the history of investment protection agreements as such – with the multitude of bilateral investment agreements signed from the 1950s onwards, the exponential growth in the number of investment claims since the 1990s and the reasons behind this, and the current trend of including investment protection chapters in trade agreements, which, unlike bilateral investment agreements, do not have a window of opportunity to terminate or amend.

Key message should be that countries/governments should be much more aware of what crucial capacities and assets they are giving up in order to gain dubious trade and investment benefits: there is no decisive evidence that investment agreements attract more investment, while the trade generated as a result of free trade agreements tends to lock developing countries into global value chains controlled by powerful TNCs while limiting opportunities for balanced domestic economic development – not in the least because trade agreements compel governments to irreversibly liberalise and commercialise vital public services, jeopardizing universal and affordable access for all. The current model for trade and investment relations benefits economic elites and contributes to growing inequality, both between and within countries.

### **Session 1 (phase 1): Trade and investment agreements – fundamentals of the framework**

The session needs to highlight how modern trade agreements in their focus on trade in services and investment go well beyond traditional agreements that only dealt with cross-border trade in goods. It needs to highlight how, because of this new, much further reaching trade focus, modern trade and investment agreements have severe and far-reaching impacts on sustainable development and the scope for self-determination of sovereign countries. These aren't any longer trade agreements. They are agreements of the elites to change the basics of their societies. It is like changing the constitutions. And everything is suddenly under the control of Wall Street listed enterprises.

The session needs to make very clear that in signing trade and investment agreements states are relinquishing their right to regulate in the wider public interest, that these agreements primarily serve big and footloose transnational enterprise at the expense of small and medium-sized, locally or regionally oriented industry that is much more firmly rooted in society and provides much more stable development opportunities.

## *Trade Agreement EU – Vietnam as example*

Addressing the problems with the trade and investment agenda can be done on the basis of the EU-Vietnam free trade and investment agreement, which the EU put forward as the new model for trade relations with developing countries (and which is different from TTIP as model for agreements between industrialised countries). It is showcased as development-friendly and beneficial to a balanced sustainable development. But a closer look reveals that the EU-Vietnam trade agenda continues to enshrine some very problematic elements, like irreversible liberalization, hampering governments to regulate and set performance requirements for incoming investment, Investor-state dispute settlement, with potentially severe impacts for public budgets and the risk of regulatory chill.

### **Session 2 (phase 1): Investment protection and ISDS/ICS**

Zoom in on investment. The workshop should focus on what constitutes sustainable investment and the tension between the need to attract sustainable development and the trade and investment framework.

- Zoom in on the dangers of ISDS: system is growing exponentially; crippling damages are borne by public budgets at the expense of social policies; highlight cases related to extractives and land grabbing – these are relevant to Mongolia. Extractive companies are main users of ISDS
- Zoom in on the proposals for reform of the ISDS system that the EU has included in EU-Vietnam FTA. The EU promotes this new Investment Court System, but it does not address the systemic flaws associated with ISDS.
- Highlight the risks of including investment chapter + investor-state dispute settlement in a comprehensive trade agreement: bilateral investment agreements have a built in time frame to revise/terminate which FTAs have not: this constitutes a relinquishing of sovereignty, because revisions can only be made in agreement with the other party.
- Highlight the risk of ISDS in the Mongolian context: The Khan resources case. Mongolia has already decided to terminate a tax treaty with the Netherlands, because of adverse development impacts. Investment protection – including the EU's ICS - should be observed with equal reservation

### **Session 3 (phase 2): Resistance against trade and investment agreements from civil society and sovereign states**

Exchange of experiences with resistance against the neoliberal trade and investment agenda from civil society and governments, embarking on a revision or termination of the existing investment agreements. Discuss how resistance from both regions may be harnessed to reinforce each other's efforts. Visions, perspectives and strategies can be extrapolated from the discussions and brought together in a paper to be published after the event.

- very briefly highlight cases: Gabriel Mining, Achmea, Lone Pine, Veolia/Egypt, Philip Morris, etc.
- Zoom in on Indonesia, which is developing a new model investment agreement to avoid further restraints on policy space, after having been forced to abandon public interest regulation under threat from claims from the extractives industry.

- Indonesian speaker from Indonesia for Global Justice – possibly Rachmi Hertanti?
- Zoom in on India, which revised its foreign investment policy after escalating tax disputes with Vodaphone and others.

Also highlight the shortcomings of these revisions from a civil society/sustainability perspective. Indonesia, for example, missed the opportunity to include investor obligations/ a human rights perspective in its new model investment treaty.

#### **Session 4 (phase 3): Strategising**

Have an open space meeting to which we invite all speakers and participants from the workshops on trade and investment to sit together, network and discuss what might follow from AEPF11, the trade and investment cluster and all the workshops.

**Note:** The Thematic Cluster '**Socially Just Trade, Production and Investment**' is being coordinated by Sustainable Development Research Institute (Mongolia), Focus on the Global South (Bangkok), Monitoring Sustainability of Globalizations (MSN, Malaysia), Transnational Institute (TNI, The Netherlands), and Rosa Luxemburg Foundation (RLS, Germany)

## **Thematic Cluster:**

# **Social Justice: social protection for all, decent work, essential services, tax justice, and other egalitarian alternatives to debt and austerity measures**

---

## **BACKGROUND**

---

Social justice is based on the principle of keeping people rather than profit at the centre of policy-making. It seeks to stop and correct the major historical impacts of the dominant socio-economic geopolitical system: chronic poverty, and widening inequality and exclusion. Concretely, in Asia, despite a booming economy, workers' rights are crushed amid massive joblessness, work informalisation, and poverty-level income; peasants are dispossessed of their land; and millions live in hovels with barely any access to necessities for a life of dignity. In Europe, economic and social rights are also under attack through severe austerity measures. Worldwide, mega rich-skewed tax policies, tax havens, and illegal money flows result in foregone revenues that could finance social programmes.

The thematic events on social justice starts with naming the problem and finding ways to redistribute resources and giving equal access to income, opportunities, and services.

The “social” policies proposed by multilateral institutions International Monetary Fund, World Bank, Asian Development Bank, European Union, etc. complement neoliberal economic policies and are at their service. This means there can be no universal comprehensive social protection, but only targeted safety net programmes for the poor with privatised social services through public-private-partnerships, ensuring monopolistic profits to big business.

While at different levels of development, Europe and Asia face the same challenges: to pursue social justice with a renewed and more meaningful role for the State and social movements.

Today, this task is particularly daunting as democracy is receding and an authoritarian form of neoliberalism is being imposed. The proposed thematic events aim to share knowledge and insights towards building common and deeper understanding among participants. We aim to strengthen solidarities and pursue collective strategies and actions towards claiming basic human rights to decent work, essential services, and social security, as well as towards democratic ownership and control of essential services and resources, including work, which are vital to life.

---

## **PHASE ONE: THE PROBLEM (GENERAL CONTEXT & ANALYSIS)**

---

The overarching problem is an authoritarian neoliberal capitalism and its social paradigm. Social policies, which should be objectives in themselves, are instead oriented towards the economy, growth, and productivity. Progressive policies should thus tackle neoliberalism, including the dogma of free trade, and strive for genuine state-guaranteed social policies with people's control, achieving all economic and social human rights.

With speakers from Mongolia, France, Hungary, India, Cambodia

---

## **PHASE TWO: LESSONS LEARNT (ALTERNATIVES, STRUGGLES, & PRACTICES)**

---

What successful struggles have there been in the past years in North and South, Europe and Asia? What can we learn from them, particularly on vital common concerns like health, labour, water, social security, etc.? What alliances have been made (movements, trade unions, etc.) and how necessary or useful were these political outlets?

**SESSION 1: BEST PRACTICES & CASES** A look into civil society, government, or joint initiatives that have been put into practice -- their strengths and weaknesses.

Birgit Daiber (Common Good Network, Germany/Italy: Welfare State in the EU and the Struggles to Preserve it; on-going State Experiments on the Basic Income Grant

Samuel Li (AMRC, Hong Kong: China's Social Protection System:)

Usa Kiewhrord (HelpAge International, Thailand: Universal Health Care and Social Pension in Southeast Asia:

Surya Tjandra (Atmaja Jaya University, Indonesia: Social Security in Indonesia

Emma Aguinot (Oxfam Southeast Asia, Laos: Livelihood in Mekong Region:

**SESSION 2: ALTERNATIVES BEING PURSUED IN ASIA & EUROPE** An enriched discussion on alternatives with inputs from Session 1, plus key recommendations on agenda content (for government and civil society), and campaigns civil society. How can these proposed or actualised changes be collectively effected, expanded, or replicated elsewhere?

With inputs from Belgium, Spain, Hungary, Bangladesh, and Mongolia

## **PHASE THREE: STRATEGISING & PLANNING**

Factoring in lessons learnt, what ways are already being done in Asia and Europe, North and South, can we adopt or improve on? What strategies and actions can be developed -- across regional, inter-regional, and international levels -- that contribute to the necessary systemic change? What alliances should be made/how can movements be perpetuated? What common actions can we take or common demands can we make? How do we link the anti-free trade movements and the campaigns for tax justice to the movements for social justice and climate justice? How can these contribute to the growing awareness of the need for fundamental change in the economic and social paradigms in order to realise genuine democracy, freedom, and human rights? What time frames and tasks, including internal and external communication?

With contributions from Germany, Philippines, India, Belgium, ..

**NOTE:** The Thematic cluster '**Social Justice**' is being coordinated by Mongolia Trade Union (Mongolia), Network for Transformative Social Protection/Institute for Popular Democracy (Philippines), Global Social Justice/ATTAC France, and 11.11.11 (Belgium)

## **Thematic Cluster:**

# **PEACE BUILDING AND HUMAN SECURITY: RESPONSES TO MIGRATION AND FUNDAMENTALISM AND TERRORISM**

---

## **BACKGROUND AND INTRODUCTION**

In 2014, within the framework of the tenth Asia-Europe People Forum, the “Peace and Security” Circle, in coordination with peace movements in Asia and Europe, organized a series of activities which discussed a variety of issues including military spending and arms transfer/arms trade, nuclear weapons and weapons of mass destruction; killer drones, killer robots, other secret weapons and infrastructures; disarmament policies and conflict prevention in Asia and Europe, etc.

At the Milan forum, various recommendations were made and submitted to ASEM leaders in order to maintain peace and security in the two continents and the world as a whole.

Two years later, it can be seen that some countries said they would cut programs and military weapons to reduce the defence budget deficit; meanwhile the defence budget has been increased continuously in other countries for decades. Besides the conflicts and disputes in hot spots including South China Sea and East China Sea, the long-running crisis in the Korean Peninsula has continued to evolve in complex and dangerous ways.

The development of the terror group calling itself the Islamic State (IS) and other terrorist movements continue killing innocent people, using violence as a way of threatening the world’s security. The Russian plane crash in Egypt on 1<sup>st</sup> November, killing 224 people and the terrorist attacks on the street in Paris claiming the lives of at least 153 people on 13 November are just two of many cases in point. There are many other episodes of such wanton killings that we could cite.

The current refugee crisis in Europe, constantly in the headlines, is said to be the result of conflicts, tensions and human insecurity in the Middle East and elsewhere (such as the long conflicts and other oppressions in Africa and Afghanistan and many other regions).

In such a context, peace movements and people’s organizations in Asia and Europe have organised various activities to contribute to suggest solutions to these problems. However, there have not been adequate cooperation and connection between movements and movements and states, to create effective synergies in the struggle for peace.

## **OBJECTIVES:**

- To have an overview of the Peace and Security situation in Asia and Europe (Providing context, status, perspectives and challenges);
- To learn from shared experiences and examine perspectives challenges for appropriate and meaningful peoples' responses to Migration, Fundamentalism, Terrorism;
- To look at alternative visions and strategies for Peoples Action for Peace and Security in Asia and Europe;
- To strengthen the network of peace movements and people's organizations in Asia and Europe;
- To make recommendations to ASEM leaders.

## **PROPOSED WORKSHOPS**

### **Workshop 1**

#### **Peace and Security in Asia and Europe: Context, Status, Perspectives and Challenges**

Focus of the Workshop: Overview of Peace and Security Situation in Asia and Europe: perspectives on major powers' relations, on China's global strategy and its implications on global peace and security. Issues of nuclear weapons, weapons of mass destruction, foreign military bases, arms trade and military spending will also be taken up as they relate to the overall peace and security situation in Asia and Europe.

#### **Presentations:**

1. Chito Sta. Romana, Philippines: Overview of Peace and Security in Asia and Europe
2. Jenny Clegg, UK: China's Global Strategy and its Implications on Global Peace and Security
3. Pham Van Chuong, Vietnam: Peaceful Resolution of Disputes and Conflicts
4. Lisa Clark, International Peace Bureau: Military Spending, Arms Trade, Foreign Military Bases
5. Mihyeon Lee, Peoples Solidarity for Participatory Democracy: Nuclear Weapons & Weapons of Mass Destruction

Output: Concrete proposals and Workshop report. Full report for documentation and 1 page report summary for the AEPF People's Vision Group.

### **Workshop 2**

#### **Responses to Migration, Fundamentalism and Terrorism**

Focus of the Workshop: Perspectives, Challenges and Responses: Migration, Fundamentalism and Terrorism in Asia and Europe including NATO

Presentations:

1. Oksana Chelysheva, Ukraine Peace Committee: Migration, Terrorism in Europe and NATO
2. . Farooq Tariq, Awami Workers Party, Pakistan: Migration, Fundamentalism, Terrorism in Asia
3. Carsten Schatz, RLS, Germany: Refugee Crisis (including what European Union is doing
4. Building (IID-GPPAC): Threats and Opportunities to Peace and Peace
5. Speaker from Mongolia: Responses to Migration, Fundamentalism, Terrorism

Output: Concrete proposals and Workshop report. Full report for documentation and 1 page report summary for the AEPF People's Vision Group.

### **Workshop 3**

#### **Strategies for People's Vision of Peace and Security in Asia and Europe**

Focus of the Workshop: Recommendations for future directions and cooperation (concrete proposals, joint projects, and strategies for action); Networking among Peace Movements; What EU Does and Should Do.

1. Anuradha Chenoy, India: Alternative Visions and Strategies for Peoples Action for Peace and Security in Asia and Europe
2. Peter van Tuijl, GPPAC: Peace Building and Dialogue Process on Northeast Asia
3. Meri Joyce, Peace Boat: Networking Among Peace Movements and People's Organizations in Asia and Europe – how to create Synergies for the Struggle for Peace and Justice
4. Kalle Sysikaski, Finnish AEPF Committee: What should the EU do?
5. Mongolia speaker: People's recommendations for the solutions of Peace and Security issues

Output: Concrete proposals and Workshop report. Full report for documentation and 1 page report summary for the AEPF People's Vision Group.

**Note:** The Thematic Cluster '**Peace Building and Human Security**' is being coordinated by Transparency International (Mongolia), Vietnam Peace and Development Foundation/Stop the War Coalition, and the Finnish AEPF Committee

## **Thematic Cluster: Participatory Democracy, Gender Equality and Minority Rights – Foundations for Equitable and inclusive societies**

---

### **BACKGROUND**

---

Our AEPF10 Final Declaration stated that “*Our governments have the responsibility to ensure that we can all live in peace, security and dignity... We, the citizens have already taken our responsibility by taking our governments to task through our participation in the creation and implementation of radical and creative solutions needed for people centred recovery and change... We are working for people-centred responses to the current crises ...with priority for poor, excluded and marginalised people. .. more democratic and accountable institutions must be in place to assure that processes and measures will lead to a just, equal and sustainable world based on respect for gender equality and the promotion and protection of human, economic and socio-cultural rights and environmental security.* “

Participatory Democracy, Gender Equality and Minority Rights are fundamental to taking our agendas forward. However in many ASEM countries, many citizens and migrants and refugees are experiencing different forms of a crisis of democracy.

Corporate influences on national and regional policy and practice are perceived to be growing, distorting and limiting democracies. What are perceived as ‘traditional’ political parties are being perceived as becoming increasingly elitist, exclusive and excluding. Women and minorities remain disproportionately excluded from political parties and processes. Over the last twenty years, when democracies have claimed to have become more embedded across many countries and regions, economic and social inequalities have grown. According to even the ABD and the IMF, we live in more socially and economically unequal societies. Our current democratic practice has not closed the gaps and divisions between peoples and groups but increased them. To build more socially and economically equal societies we need to build democracies and processes of political and economic governance that are able to contribute to this. Masculinity and patriarchal sets of values have kept women and minorities away from the political processes earlier and now, additionally, from the decision making processes.

More participatory, inclusive, less patriarchal democracies are essential to build more just and inclusive societies. This must not sound like a dream to wish and work for?

Participatory democracy means many forms of direct democratic involvement of citizens in addition to formal parliamentary and local democracy. This can include public hearings on government policies and programmes, participatory budgets and budgeting, citizens’ initiatives regarding urban planning, consumers’ interest or food security, vibrant space for social movements and organisations, in short many ways to express active citizenship and for it to shape and inform political parties and processes. The key principle is inclusion instead of exclusion and marginalisation.

We strongly believe that there cannot be participatory democracy without gender, LGBTI and minority rights, and that there cannot be gender, LGBTI and minority rights without participation and participatory democracy.

Social movements, active citizens organisations and networks are working strategically with a twofold approach: trying to influence governments and governance structures so that they respect, protect and fulfil political, economic, social and cultural rights of all citizens including minorities, indigenous people and migrants, and at the same time building spaces and structures from below to ensure that human and citizens' rights are respected, protected, and fulfilled for everybody.

How do we build what some call feminist and inclusive democracies - systems of politics and governance, which enable women, and men and children, to enjoy and exercise their full human rights? How do we build feminist and inclusive democracies where the elimination of the oppression of women and minorities, all gender-based inequalities and other forms of social, economic and cultural inequalities are its central goals, which would develop and install economic and social policies which further economic and social justice and are part of more equal societies?

These are the core questions, which we will discuss, and share. We will hear about a range of ways that women and minorities are increasingly claiming the space to speak, and the power to decide and act. At AEPF11 we hope to be able to hear from women and representatives of minorities, of migrants and refugees, on how they have been able to work for more participatory democracies, to work for gender equality and to make minority rights a reality. We hope to hear about the challenges that people and their organisations have faced, the strategies and practices that they have taken forward in response and their plans and visions for the future.

---

## **PHASE ONE: CONTEXT, PROBLEMS AND TAKING OUR AGENDAS FORWARD**

---

### **Moderators and Introduction:**

Gunsen Sharaid Borkhuu, Elbegdorj Institute, Mongolia  
Andy Rutherford, Fresh Eyes, United Kingdom

Discussion of examples how participatory democracy can work in different political contexts and how it can contribute to the promotion, protection and enforcement of social and economic justice, gender equality and diversity, and minority rights.

### **Presentations:**

Ruth Caravantes Vidriales, 15M and Feminist Movement, Spain  
Surekha Dalvi, Dr.P.V.Madlik Trust, India  
Bat-Erdeniin Batbayar, Mongolia

### **Roundtable discussion**

“No participatory democracy without gender, LGBTI and minority rights, no gender, LGBTI and minority rights without participation and participatory democracy.”

Including:

Kristos Giovanopoulos, Solidarity4All, Greece  
Alexander Hammelburg, COC, Netherlands  
Sukhjargalmaa Dugersuren, MONGFEMNET, Mongolia  
Susanna Hla Hla Soe, Karen Women's Action Group (KWAG), Myanmar (tbc)

**Introduction to the Participatory Democracy Wall.** Invitation to all to contribute

---

## **PHASE TWO: LESSONS LEARNT: BEST PRACTICES AND CASES**

---

**Moderator and Introduction:**

Evelyn Balais-Serrano, Forum Asia

Zolzaya Batkhuyag, Women for change, Mongolia

In many countries democratic decision making, citizens' participation and gender, minority and migrants' rights are threatened by authoritarian governments, neoliberal policies, corporate power and right wing populism. What responses do social movements and civil society organisations have? Success and failures in bringing forward our agenda of rights and justice

**Presentations:**

Kinga Lohmann, Karat, Poland

Dr. Varsha Rajan Berry, Coordinator, Mrinal Gore Interactive Centre for Social Justice and Peace in South Asia, India

Anaraa Nyamdorj, LGBT Centre, Mongolia

**Reactors:**

Christa Wichterich, WIDE+, Germany

Tur-Od Lkhagvajav, Transparency International, Mongolia,

Anselmo Lee, Asia Democracy Network, South Korea

---

**PHASE THREE: STRATEGISING & PLANNING**

---

1. What strategies and actions can be developed -- across regional, inter-regional, and international levels -- that contribute to the necessary change? What alliances should be made/how can movements be strengthened? What common actions can we take or common demands can we make?
2. Agreement on narrative and recommendations to be part of the AEPF11 Final Declaration

Discussion moderated by thematic co-organisers

Gunsen Sharaid Borkhuu, Sukhjargalmaa Dugersuren, Anaraa Nyamdorj, Evelyn Balais-Serrano, Anselmo Lee, Dr. Varsha Rajan Berry, Andy Rutherford, Christa Wichterich

**Note:** The Thematic Cluster '**Participatory Democracy, Gender Equality and Minority Rights**' is being coordinated by EBI (Mongolia), MONFEMNET (Mongolia), LGBT Centre (Mongolia), FORUM Asia, Mrinal Gore Centre (India), and FreshEyes (GB)