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Introduction
Since the term “civil society” first appeared in a G8 Summit document at the Halifax Summit in 1995, these organizations have been particularly strategic about their involvement with summit activities.¹ In the past decade, demonstrations and NGO campaigns around the summits have garnered their fair share of media attention, with far-reaching demonstrations becoming increasingly commonplace.

According to the University of Toronto’s Peter Hajnal, civil society’s interaction with the G8 can be categorized into four distinct periods: 1981-1994, a “period of the earliest form of dialogue” and interaction; 1995-1997, a “period of formal recognition” by G8 member-states, and; 1998-present, a “period of well-structured cooperation.”² By 2006, they were being involved in formal consultations, albeit in a relatively minor capacity. Since then, civil society groups have been a mainstay.

The goal of the 2010-2011 Civil Society Studies Report is to provide an analysis of the strategies used by civil society groups to influence G8 decision-making, particularly in the time leading up to, during, and after the 36th Annual G8 Summit in Muskoka, Canada. To this end, we identified ten (10) civil society sub-groups that perceive G8 lobbying to be an important strategy to their organizational objectives. The sub-groups are:

1. Developmental Non-Governmental Organizations
2. Human Rights Groups
3. Environmental NGOs
4. Faith-Based Organizations
5. Philanthropic Foundations
6. Trade Unions
7. Public Policy Research Institutions (Think Tanks)
8. Service-Based Humanitarian Organizations
9. Celebrity Activists
10. Educational Campaigns

Some organizations — e.g., Oxfam and World Vision — fall into more than one category. In this report, their activities will be discussed in their relevant sub-groups (i.e., Oxfam’s work on climate change initiatives under “Environmental Non-Governmental Organizations,” World Vision’s participation in the G8 World Religions Summit under “Faith-Based Organizations”).

Note: All figures mentioned in the report are in U.S. dollars.

Research Methodology
The scope of this report was determined using the London School of Economics Centre for Civil Society’s definition of “civil society”:

Civil society refers to the arena of uncoerced collective action around shared interests, purposes and values. In theory, its institutional forms are distinct from those of the state, family, and market, though in practice, the boundaries between state, civil society, family and market are often complex, blurred and negotiated. Civil society commonly embraces a diversity of spaces, actors and institutional forms, varying in their degree of formality, autonomy and power. Civil societies are often populated by organizations such as registered charities, development non-governmental organizations, community groups, women’s organizations, faith-based organizations, professional associations, trade unions, self-help groups, social movements, business associations, coalitions and advocacy groups.\(^3\)

The report assesses civil society’s involvement with the G8 by analyzing strategies used by subgroups. Each report section was researched according to a standardized set of indicators:

1. The first strategy, Policy, Press Statements and Utilization of Media, details how subgroups used various communications mediums to lobby the G8 and engage with the wider public.
2. The second, Summit Protests, takes a look at demonstrations held by civil society subgroups. Public Awareness Events pays particular attention to campaigns mounted by civil society groups to lobby G8 member states and create public awareness of their objectives.
3. Collaborative Efforts examines cooperation between civil society groups.
4. G8-Civil Society Initiatives assesses official G8 engagement with civil society groups, such as formal consultations and special events.
5. Finally, Summit Outcomes are a discussion on the overall reaction of individual subgroups to the G8 Summit.

---

Developmental Non-governmental Organizations
Niamh Fitzgerald and Kwaku Boateng

Global development has been a fixture on G8 Summit agendas dating back to the group’s very
first meeting. Developmental NGOs aim to alleviate global poverty and promote sustainable
development in impoverished countries of the world. At G8 Summits, developmental
organizations lobby G8 leaders to prioritize global aid and adopt policies that (in their view) are
favourable to long-term development. In the past, much of the attention given to international
development has come in the way of empty promises by G8 leaders.

In recent years, Developmental NGOs have increasingly played a fundamental role in influencing
the G8 agenda, monitoring the G8 countries’ activities and pressuring international leaders to
adhere to their summit commitments; these organizations are often some of the largest and most
influential civil society actors. Developmental NGOs seek to address and combat economic,
social and political problems in developing countries and strive to achieve solutions that promote
sustainability and growth.

Developmental NGOs range from large, bureaucratic organizations such as the International
Committee of the Red Cross and the Agha Khan Foundation to small grassroots organizations.
Many of these organizations advocate for and work towards the fulfillment of the Millennium
Development Goals (MDGs). Corresponding with the mandates of countless developmental
organizations, the MDGs aim to eradicate extreme hunger and poverty, reduce child mortality,
 improve maternal health, combat HIV/AIDS, malaria and other diseases, achieve universal
primary education and develop a global partnership for development (which includes the
provision of Official Development Assistance (ODA) to least developed countries (LDCs) and
African countries), among other goals.4

Developmental NGOs frequently make their views known through reports and communiqués that
they publish as well as through the broader media. This has helped to generate a growing global
public awareness of the G8’s work. The G8 leaders, like all leaders, are extremely susceptible to
public opinion and the ability of developmental NGOs to rile the public in support of their various
causes has been nothing short of remarkable at past G8 summits. At the 2005 Gleneagles Summit,
for example, the Make Poverty History Campaign had a pronounced impact on the G8
proceedings, as hundreds of thousands of people participated in peaceful demonstrations to show
their support of Make Poverty History. Former British Prime Minister Tony Blair even remarked:
“I can’t think of a campaign that has been so brilliantly organized or struck such a chord with
such a large number of people worldwide.”5 The influence of the campaign was undoubtedly felt
by the other G8 leaders as well that year, as they allocated a sum of USD50 billion towards aid,
debt relief and trade.6

---

The 2005 Gleneagles G8 Summit stands out as a significant success for developmental NGOs in influencing G8 decision-making. At Gleneagles, leaders of the G8 nations pledged to double global aid from USD25 billion to USD50 billion in five years, with half going to African states. Also at the 2005 Gleneagles Summit, the G8 promised that in five years, access to life-saving medication would be provided to every AIDS patient in the world. However, as of the 2010 Muskoka G8 Summit, the group was significantly behind on its 2005 promises.

Against the backdrop of disappointment at the 2009 L’Aquila G8 Summit, many developmental NGOs viewed the 2010 Muskoka Summit as crucial for G8 accountability. Developmental NGOs participated at the summit with the aim of pushing the leaders to “reaffirm the Gleneagles commitments in the G8 communiqué and recognize their shortfall,” and commit to additional funding to address the United Nations Millennium Development Goals. The Summit was also billed by the 2010 Canadian G8 Civil Society Coordinating Committee as Canada’s opportunity to show its leadership in international development and environmental sustainability.

The agenda of the 2010 G8 Muskoka Summit focused heavily on fostering global economic recovery in light of the recent global economic crisis. The primary development issue addressed was the improvement of maternal and child healthcare throughout the developing world. While some developmental NGOs lauded the G8 for their commitment to tackling these issues, many others were concerned that the group was not doing enough and were highly critical of the G8 countries regarding both their lack of compliance to past commitments to increase ODA and healthcare funding, and the limited nature of the 2010 commitments, which many claimed did not go far enough.

This report will detail the actions of developmental NGOs during the 2010 G8 Muskoka Summit and their responses to the outcomes of the summit. Several NGOs utilized print, online and social media to make their opinions known to the broader public. Summit protests, however, were minimal. The increasing influence of developmental NGOs and other civil society actors was evident from the presence of many organizations at the summit itself, although media access proved to be a contentious issue.

---

Summit Participation

Policy Papers, Press Statements and Utilization of Media

The 2010 Canadian G8 Civil Society Coordinating Committee developed a G8 Civil Society Platform and presented it to Prime Minister Steven Harper in the lead-up to the Summit. In a document it called an agenda for global development, the committee urged the Canadian government to “promote a new model of globalization that is socially responsible, economically sustainable, and environmentally just.” Specifically, it called on Canada to create a G8 Agenda that prioritizes three interlinked areas: combating poverty, transforming the global economic and financial system, and acting on climate change.

Developmental NGOs across the globe called on the G8 leaders to reaffirm their commitment made at the 2005 Gleneagles Summit, to provide USD50 billion of aid to developing countries, USD25 billion of which would go to Africa. By all accounts, the G8 had fallen short of this promise. The Muskoka Accountability report released by the G8 reported an estimated USD7 billion shortfall.12 The ONE campaign’s DATA report 2010 claimed that the G8 failed to reach its target by at least USD8.9 billion.13 “According to the Africa Progress Report 2010, published by a unique panel of internationalists, chaired by Kofi Annan,” the G8 would fall short by approximately USD9.8 billion by the end of 2010.14 These numbers indicated an immense failure on the part of the G8 and incited a great deal of pressure from developmental NGOs for the G8 to recommit itself to delivering the promised aid. Organizations entreated the G8 countries to maintain their commitment to the Gleneagles pledges and to continue to ardently pursue the MDGs by the year 2015.

Leading up to the summit, the ONE campaign published a policy brief entitled “Recommendations for the G8 and G20 Summits” wherein they outlined strategies centred around “accountability, transparency and poverty-reducing economic growth to accelerate progress towards the MDGs” and to achieve “the historic 2005 G8 commitments.”15 Similarly, CARE International published policy recommendations for the Muskoka Summit, one of which was: “G8 governments must give priority to the world’s poorest regions, giving special attention to responding to the needs in Africa, in line with the pledges made at Gleneagles and in support of the commitments and ongoing efforts of African countries, including in the context of the African Union.”16 CARE International also advocated for more funding to “accelerate progress on
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“MDGs” and commended the “Canadian government’s prioritization of maternal, newborn and child health (MNCH) at the upcoming G8 Summit.”

Other NGOs were less complimentary towards the G8. For example, three days before the summit, Stephen Lewis of the Stephen Lewis Foundation angrily criticized the G8 for “explicitly cutting back on funding for HIV/AIDS.” He insisted that “if the G8 and G20 are to do more than dissemble, they have to match their actions to their commitments.”

Still other developmental NGOs offered further recommendations and criticisms of the G8. In an article published in the Globe and Mail on 23 June 2010, Dr. James Orbinski and James Fraser, co-founders of Dignitas International, implored the G8 (and the Canadian government, in particular) not to neglect their Gleneagles commitment to ensure universal access to treatment for people living with HIV/AIDS by 2010, but rather, to “meet their prior commitments and global responsibilities” by increasing funding for treatment.

Médecins Sans Frontières (MSF) President Dr. Christophe Fournier warned that the G8 will fail to achieve their goal of improving maternal and child health in developing countries unless they “commit to reforming key parts of the global food aid system” to combat malnutrition. He further emphasized the importance of sustainable development, insisting that the fight against malnutrition requires sustainable sources of funding as opposed to “the one-shot pledges that G8 summits are prone to deliver.”

On the eve of the Summit, Oxfam International issued a press release on its website calling for G8 leaders to keep the promises they made at the 2005 Gleneagles G8 Summit. The Oxfam statement declared that the group was failing to live up to its commitment. As of June 2010, estimates held members as much as USD20 billion short of fulfilling the promise. “Behind each dollar they fail to provide lies a child without schooling, a patient without medicine, a woman dying in childbirth for lack of care,” said Mark Fried, spokesperson for Oxfam at the G8 Summit.

---

21 G8: Reform Food Aid to Reduce Childhood Malnutrition, Medecins sans Frontieres (Toronto) 22 June 2010. Date of Access: 7 January 2011.  
22 G8: Reform Food Aid to Reduce Childhood Malnutrition, Medecins sans Frontieres (Toronto) 22 June 2010. Date of Access: 7 January 2011.  
Freid went further by saying that “empty promises don’t make nutritious meals, buy school books or life-saving medicines.” Global Call to Action against Poverty (GCAP) also released a press statement regarding the G8’s pledges at the Gleneagles Summit. It called on the G8 leaders to acknowledge their previous commitments and develop a plan to deliver the aid they promised. In addition, ONE Campaign European Director, Olly Buston held a media briefing to discuss the organization’s expected summit outcomes.

On the opening day of the Summit, a coalition of developmental and environmental NGOs, trade unions, and faith-based organizations came together to present 1.7 million petitions to the G8 Leaders in a well-attended press conference. Featuring speakers from GCAP, World Wildlife Fund (WWF), ActionAid, Canadian Labour Conference, and the Malawian Association of Midwives, the petition called on summit leaders to “keep their promises to the world’s poor and invest in the future.” The organizations urged the G8 to show more accountability with regards to commitments on Maternal and Child Health, climate change effects on the developing world, HIV/AIDS treatment programs, and universal education.

During the summit itself, representatives from several developmental NGOs gave interviews and published press releases encouraging the G8 leaders to comply with their commitments to help the world’s poor and disadvantaged. On 25 June 2010, activists from Make Poverty History beseeched the G8 to take significant action in fighting poverty in developing countries and to deliver the remainder of the funds promised at the Gleneagles Summit.

Dorothy Ngoma, Executive Director of the National Organization of Nurses and Midwives in Malawi, criticized the G8 for their negligence in protecting the lives of women and their past failures concerning maternal and child health. She urged the G8 not to abandon the women who suffer due to lack of proper medical care and to fulfil their Gleneagles pledge of USD50 billion of


aid for the developing world.\textsuperscript{33} Teresa Healy of the Canadian Labour Union encouraged the G8 to formulate and adhere to a concrete strategy to assist people living with HIV/AIDS throughout the developing world.\textsuperscript{34}

These and other developmental organizations made their views concerning the G8 and its agenda known through policy papers and publications on their websites, interviews with the press, newspaper articles, blogs, and various forms of social media including Twitter and Facebook.

The G8 leaders collectively acknowledged the influence of developmental NGOs and other civil society actors in a document entitled “G8 Muskoka Declaration Recovery and New Beginnings” published on 26 June 2010, which outlines the key commitments of the 2010 Muskoka Summit. The G8 leaders stated that the achievement of the MDGs by 2015 will require a collaborative global effort on behalf of national governments, international organizations, non-governmental organizations and civil society and other actors.\textsuperscript{35} Furthermore, the G8 commended NGOs for their commitment to developmental issues, saying “we welcome the ongoing research and advocacy of international NGOs and local civil society as an important contribution to [development].”\textsuperscript{36}

**Summit Protests**

Perhaps because of its remote location, the 2010 Summit saw no significant protests by developmental NGOs. Much media attention was focused on the subsequent G20 Summit in Toronto, which saw unprecedented protests, demonstrations, and marches by a number of civil society groups in the days leading up to meeting.\textsuperscript{37} The little demonstration that drew media attention at the G8 Summit was Oxfam International’s Big Heads publicity stunt.\textsuperscript{38} The organization staged a demonstration in which people wearing giant heads of G8 leaders were concealing themselves behind a banner stating “Keep Your Promises.” The banner then slipped and the Big Heads were left exposed, with only little maple leaves covering their private parts.

During the summit itself, the developmental NGO Oxfam staged a publicity stunt to encourage the G8 leaders to place extreme poverty on the agenda and devote significant attention to this pressing development issue. The stunt featured the protestors wearing giant papier-mâché heads of the leaders of the G8 countries.\textsuperscript{39} The Oxfam Big Heads garnered significant media attention
with their various demonstrations, one of which featured them positioned behind a large banner stating “Keep Your Promises.”

**Public Awareness Events/Workshops**
Following the end of the 2010 G8 Summit, World Vision Canada put together a visual representation titled “Pregnant with Promises” at a cathedral in Toronto. Advertised as a representation of what occurred at the summit, the visual display portrayed G8 leaders as pregnant with the promises they made regarding Maternal and Child Health. The purpose was to educate the public on the pledges made by the leaders and to hold them accountable to them.

**Collaborative Efforts (NGO Forum and External Partners)**
On the first day of the summit, 25 June 2010, a conglomerate of developmental NGOs and coalitions (including ActionAid, Make Poverty History, the Canadian Council for International Co-operation and the Association of Malawian Midwives) as well as other civil society actors collaborated to present global petitions with over 1.7 million signatures to the G8 (and G20) leaders. The NGOs collectively urged the G8 leaders to respond to the wishes of their citizens and others across the globe by taking affirmative action that will produce tangible results on matters of development, particularly in regard to maternal and child health, treatment for people living with HIV/AIDS and access to universal education. Although no official statement was released by Canadian Prime Minister Stephen Harper on the nature or influence of the petitions, the numbers were recorded by the Prime Minister’s Office prior to the summit.

Various other developmental NGOs joined forces to make a last-minute push on the final night of summit negotiations to get the G8 to address the 2005 Gleneagles commitments in its final communiqué. Among others, the organizations included At the Table/Make Poverty History, Oxfam International, and ONE Campaign. The Muskoka Summit saw no discussion on the critically important pledge, toward which, set to expire in 2010, the G8 had made little progress. For this reason, getting the G8 leaders to include language acknowledging the 2005 commitment in its 2010 Summit communiqué was crucial. Much to the disappointment of developmental NGOs and other civil society organizations, the Gleneagles pledge was not mentioned in the Muskoko G8 Summit final communiqué.

---


41 G8 Leaders were Pregnant with Promises – What did they Deliver? World Vision Canada, 26 June 2010. Date of Access: 9 January 2011. [http://www.worldvision.ca/About-Us/Newsroom/press-releases/Pages/g8-leaders-were-pregnant-with-promises-what-did-they-deliver.aspx](http://www.worldvision.ca/About-Us/Newsroom/press-releases/Pages/g8-leaders-were-pregnant-with-promises-what-did-they-deliver.aspx)


**G8-Civil Society Initiatives**

As representatives for political leaders of the host nation of the G8 Summit, sherpas consult with other G8 leaders and prepare the agendas for the G8 Summit. In preparation for the 2010 Summit, the sherpas organized a “Civil-G8 Dialogue” with 60 civil society advocacy groups from around the world to discuss policy and summit expectations. While there was some disagreement at the meeting, the general agreement was that the G8 was failing to meet its previously made commitments on aid and development.

Leading up to the summit, Make Poverty History successfully lobbied the Canadian government to create a G8 Accountability Report assessing progress on G8 commitments at past summits. The report detailed the group’s activities, addressing key promises on issues such as health, debt relief, education, food security, and the environment.

In an uncustomary move, the Canadian government created an Alternative Media Centre distinctly for civil society organizations, including national and international NGOs, Student and Trade Unions, and bloggers. Civil society was isolated from the main media centre, where the rest of the world’s mainstream media received access to cover news and events of the summit. It was further revealed that the Alternative Media Centre did not have facilities for press conferences.

A number of leading NGOs, including the Canadian Federation of Students, Oxfam, Greenpeace International, GCAP, and three other organizations released a joint press statement condemning the Canadian government for what they called its “media apartheid.” The organizations called the isolation of civil society at the summit unbecoming of Stephen Harper’s government. Developmental NGOs were not well accommodated at the 2010 G8 Summit.

There was considerable controversy surrounding the restrictions placed on representatives of developmental NGOs who attended the 2010 G8 Muskoka Summit. While professional journalists were housed in the International Media Centre (IMC), NGO representatives were restricted to the Alternative Media Centre that was separated from the IMC by a busy street, a wire fence and concrete barriers. Few NGO representatives were given full access to the IMC.

---

47 About the Sherpa, Sherpa Times. Date of Access: 9 January 2011. 
http://www.sherpatimes.com/about.html
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and although some others managed to obtain temporary passes for a day, it involved a “long and cumbersome” process.\textsuperscript{54}

The Global Call to Action Against Poverty (GCAP), an alliance of developmental NGOs and other civil society actors, put out a press release following the summit wherein Kumi Naidoo, co-chair of GCAP, described the segregation of journalists and NGO representatives as “media apartheid.”\textsuperscript{55} The press release, which was signed by several other developmental NGOs as well as GCAP, including Make Poverty History, Oxfam, Global Health Council and ActionAid, called the separation of media “a clear attempt to limit access and dampen voices that present an independent view of the G8.”\textsuperscript{56}

Amy Boldosser of Family Care International expressed her frustration at being denied full access to the IMC, saying that “the Alternative Media Center is the Canadian government’s inegalitarian solution to concerns that civil society representatives from a broad range of issues would generate negative media coverage of G8 and G20 and their failure to meet past commitments.”\textsuperscript{57} Similarly, Dennis Howlett, the Canadian coordinator of Make Poverty History remarked that civil society was treated much more equitably and received full access to the IMC at the past two G8 Summits in Italy and Japan. He stated that the media restrictions at the 2010 Muskoka Summit are “an indication that the Canadian government does not recognize the important role civil society plays.”\textsuperscript{58}

Although the Canadian government has often acknowledged and commended developmental NGOs and other civil society actors for their work and advocacy on important issues pertaining to development, this fiercely contested media segregation does not bode well for the relationship between the Canadian government and civil society. It perhaps indicates that the Canadian government either feared the criticisms of NGOs and their ability to sway public opinion or that they did not fully appreciate the influence and importance of NGOs and their ability to provide expertise on matters of development.

**Summit Outcomes**

The outcomes of the 2010 G8 Muskoka Summit inspired a variety of reactions from developmental NGOs. Some were pleased with the G8 commitments, particularly the maternal and child health initiative, but many others expressed disappointment, claiming that the G8 countries were not doing enough to combat poverty, disease and to promote development. Amongst those NGOs that praised the summit outcomes was World Vision. World Vision’s CEO, Dave Toycen, congratulated Prime Minister Harper “for his strong leadership putting the world’s


children and mothers on the G8 agenda and offering new money.” World Vision also applauded the G8’s commitment to annually publish their aid figures in a step towards greater transparency and accountability. Despite the commendations, however, World Vision did caution that these promises must now “translate into action.”

Other NGOs were more sparing with their praise. Save the Children welcomed the maternal and child health initiative as a life-saving breakthrough for children throughout the developing world, but criticized the lack of attention given to the fulfillment of the Gleneagles commitments. Likewise, ONE applauded the USD5 billion contribution towards maternal and child health but warned that much more than this amount would be needed in order to achieve the MDGs of improving maternal health and reducing child mortality by 2015. CARE International similarly commended the Canadian government for dedicating so much attention to maternal and child health but was disappointed and “disheartened” that this resulted in a collective contribution of only USD5 billion from the G8 countries.

At the most critical end of the NGO spectrum, Oxfam called the Muskoka Summit a “summit of shame” and admonished leaders for freezing aid and for failing to deliver on their promises to help the world’s poor. The maternal and child health initiative, they declared, was a small and inadequate commitment that was put forth to draw attention away from the G8’s other broken promises.

Along with Oxfam, a number of other developmental NGOs contended that by making maternal and child health its new focus, the G8 essentially found a way to shirk promises it made at the Gleneagles Summit in 2005. With the Gleneagles pledge expiring in 2010, developmental NGOs were unsuccessful in getting the G8 to create an emergency plan addressing the commitment in the Muskoka Summit communiqué. The G8 effectively reneged on its promises made in 2005, with no mention of the Gleneagles commitment in the Muskoka Initiative.

In the wake of the G8’s revelation of its new initiative, Oxfam commented that “No maple leaf is big enough to hide the shame of Canada’s summit of broken promises. The G8’s failure will leave a sad legacy of kids out of school, denied medicines for the sick and no food for the
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The same sentiment was echoed by GCAP, which said that the Muskoka Initiative was “a step back.” Other developmental NGOs that found the initiative disappointing include The Global Campaign for Education, ActionAid, and Making Poverty History, among others.

Make Poverty History stated that the USD5 billion pledge by G8 leaders to improve maternal and child health was too small a contribution to alleviate the suffering of women and children in developing countries. They called the maternal and child health initiative a “dismal failure.” In a press release issued on 26 June 2010, the coalition of NGOs declared that other commitments from the summit offered little to justify the continued existence of the G8.

ActionAid’s criticism was directed towards the G8’s inability to once again meet the promises made at the 2005 Gleneagles Summit. Spokesperson Henry Malumo pondered how the G8 could hope to maintain its credibility and accountability with the new maternal health initiative while continuing to ignore past and outstanding commitments from 2005.

The Muskoka Initiative also received praise, albeit tepid. In a press release, World Vision remarked that it is pleased with the initiative on maternal and child health, but added that “the sense of urgency is missing.” Dave Toyce, CEO of World Vision Canada, applauded Canadian Prime Minister Stephen Harper for his “strong leadership” but tempered his praise, adding that the G8’s commitment “looks more like a small down payment than an adequate investment, and won’t reach as far as it must to stop needless early deaths.”

Perhaps the strongest approval for the Muskoka Initiative came from the Partnership for Maternal, Newborn, and Child Health (PMNCH), which welcomed it as an important step. Global Health Council also welcomed the G8’s initiative, but regretted the group’s omission of the Gleneagles promises from its final communiqué. ONE Campaign, Save the Children, and UNICEF all responded to the initiative with somewhat reluctant praise.

Overall, reaction to the 2010 G8 Muskoka Summit from developmental NGOs was more negative than positive. While the G8’s new pledge of USD5 billion promises to prevent the deaths of 1.3 million children and 64,000 mothers, for developmental NGOs, the group’s abandonment of the
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Gleneagles pledge casts a cloud on what is an otherwise positive initiative.\textsuperscript{73} Looking forward to the 2011 G8 Summit in France, nevertheless, developmental NGOs will be sure to hold G8 leaders accountable to their Muskoka pledge.
Environmental Non-governmental Organizations
Kate Bruce-Lockhart

In recent years, G8 nations have paid increasing attention to environmental sustainability. Increased public and political attention to the issue of climate change in particular has generated a much greater focus on the environment in the G8 sphere. Since the 2005 summit in Gleneagles, Scotland, climate change has occupied a central place in G8 negotiations. At this summit, G8 leaders acknowledged “that climate change is happening now, that human activity is contributing to it, and that it could affect every part of the globe.” Environmental non-government organizations (eNGOs) have exerted considerable pressure on the G8 to augment its commitment to combating climate change and assuming responsibility for environmental stewardship. These groups have emerged as prominent players in civil society, making their presence known both at summits and throughout the year through protests, publicity stunts, policy recommendations, public polls on desired environmental outcomes, social media, evaluations of G8 nations’ environmental efforts, and awareness campaigns.

Greenpeace International has been a leader in pressuring the G8, through protests, policy papers, and awareness campaigns. During the 2009 Summit in L’Aquila Italy, Greenpeace received major press coverage for its protest events. Their activists were arrested for scaling Mt. Rushmore to hang a banner that read “America Honors Leaders Not Politicians: Stop Global Warming.” Additionally, Greenpeace is active in releasing both policy recommendations and evaluations of G8 Summits, as well pre-summit preparations. In recent years, they have strongly advocated for higher emission reduction targets and more G8 funding to help developing countries mitigate the effects of climate change.

The World Wildlife Federation (WWF) has also been a key eNGO in placing pressure on the G8. They have been integral in monitoring the performance of G8 nations in regards to the environment through their “Climate Scorecards,” which have garnered major media attention. In addition, WWF also puts out regular press releases relating to environmental concerns leading up to the G8 Summits, as well publishing their assessment of each summit’s outcome.

There are numerous other eNGOs that engage with the G8 on a regular basis. Oxfam International assumed an increasingly prominent role in the 2010 Muskoka Summit, making action on climate change one of their three key summit focuses. They also gained attention for their environmental activism at the L’Aquila Summit, with their protest depicting G8 leaders cooking
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the earth in a giant cauldron. Other eNGOs that have been active in recent summits include Friends of the Earth International, the International Union for the Conservation of Nature, the Pembina Institute, and the Climate Action Network. Local eNGOs tend have also played an active part in summits based in their home nation, such as Legiambente during the L’Aquila Summit, or the Canadian Youth Climate Coalition at the Muskoka Summit.

In addition to acting individually, eNGOs have been part of collective efforts to compel the G8 to take action. At the 2007 Summit in Heiligendamm, Germany, over 400 eNGOs came together under the umbrella of the Climate Action Network to prepare a report detailing civil society’s environmental demands. They are usually included in G8 Environment Minister’s pre-summit meetings, and have also been involved in alternative civil society summits. During the 2010 Muskoka summit, several eNGOs sat on the steering committee of the People’s Summit, which launched a major campaign called “At the Table” to encourage citizens to pressure the G8 for constructive change on issues such as the environment. eNGOs have also historically joined together to write letters to G8 leaders, advising them on what action to take at upcoming summits and advocating for particular policy outcomes.

Generally, eNGOs have been disappointed and highly critical of G8 summit outcomes with regards to the environment. Most cite the lack of funding for environmental initiatives, the dearth of leadership and initiative from G8 nations, and the poor environmental policies of G8 nations as major issues. Nevertheless, eNGOs continue to lobby the G8 for greater commitments to protect the environment.

**Summit Participation**

*Policy Papers, Press Statements, and Utilization of the Media*

During the period immediately prior to the Muskoka Summit, as well as the Summit itself, eNGOs found multiple ways to garner media attention. In the month of June, a number of eNGOs released publications on their website to make their expected outcomes for the G8 Summit clear. Greenpeace International published a G8/G20 action checklist on their website. Four main demands were put forth: leaders must honor their promise to keep global temperature rise below 2 degrees Celsius, phase out the fossil fuel industry, create financial and regulatory framework that creates incentives for a green economy, and provide funds to help developing countries adapt to climate change rather than subsidizing fossil fuels.

WWF also published a series of demands on their website prior to the G8 summit. In the “G8/G20 Summit” position paper, they called the upcoming summits a “major opportunity” to
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move forward on climate change after the Copenhagen last December. Like Greenpeace, they put forth four demands: reduce emissions by reaffirming their commitment to the Copenhagen Accord (limit warming to two degrees), provide funds for developing countries, ensure accountability of G8 nations through compliance reports and providing more access to civil society. For each request, they provided a more detailed breakdown of their expectations, as well as indicators that could be used to track progress. WWF also called on Canada to step up and provide leadership by putting climate high on the summit agenda.

Oxfam Canada, who has also been a leader in environmental activism, also drew attention to the need for G8 action on the environment through various media outlets. Along with the At the Table Campaign, a coalition of civil society organizations, they created a series of photographs depicting Canadian Prime Minister Stephen Harper holding a modified Canadian five-dollar bill that read “1 billion, climate cash, 2010-2011” and changed the typical snow-filled ice hockey scene to one affected by climate change, where the snow and ice on the rink had melted. Some of these photos were also posted on the photo-sharing website flickr as part of a larger photo campaign run by At the Table designed to grab G8 leaders’ attention.

Pre-Summit Protests
Protests, one of the most common media generating activities at previous summits, were a key tool for eNGOs. As was the case in past summits, Greenpeace was active in protesting during the lead-up to the Muskoka Summit. In a notable off-site protest, three activists attempted to scale Mt. Logan, hoping to hang a banner with the message “G8/G20: Stop Climate Change.” Greenpeace is known for this sort of protest, as it has used banners in prominent locations at past summits to get their message across to G8 leaders. During the 2009 Summit in L’Aquila, over one hundred Greenpeace activists occupied four major coal fired power stations across the country, generating major media attention.

The protest for this year on Mt. Logan was less successful. Due to some safety concerns, the activists had to turn back, and were unable to finish their climb. Despite this, they still used media coverage of the event to get their message out. In a CBC report on the attempted climb, Greenpeace Canada spokesperson Alex Paterson commented on the lack of new green

technology: “Leaders like the G8 and G20 leaders have not created the space for that low-carbon green economy and for new technologies to grow.”

A number of eNGOs, including Oxfam Canada, WWF Canada, and the Climate Action Network ran a “Toxic Tour” of Toronto as a form of protest. The event was staged in the financial district of Toronto, and was held as part of the “Global Day of Action” on June 17th. The protest was designed to draw attention to inordinate costs of the G8 summit itself, which Oxfam portrayed as creating funding shortfalls for climate change initiatives.

In a press release outlining the event, Oxfam Canada Executive Director Robert Fox commented on the need for more climate change funding:

How far can $1 billion go? It can pay for three days of security or it can help millions of people adapt to the impact of climate change over the next three years...That’s Canada’s fair share of climate costs and we owe it to the world’s poorest, who are being hit first and hardest. They can’t live with broken promises or wait for the next summit for adaptation financing to finally flow.

Zoë Caron of the At the Table Campaign said the rally was meant to draw attention to the subsidies given to the fossil fuel sector. “The government has to end the subsidies...That money spent here could be put to better use.” Graham Saul of Climate Action Network Canada used the event to call for more money to help developing countries and urged world leaders to make climate change a priority: “We are calling for the world leaders to put climate change on the agenda for both summits,” said Saul. “We want to see concrete plans to increase their commitment.”

23 June 2010 was the “Environmental and Climate Justice” day of action, organized by both eNGOs and other civil society organizations. The Canadian Youth Climate Coalition was a main organizer, and posted a reflection of the event on their website. Hundreds of activists went through the streets of Toronto to visit organizations and businesses deemed responsible for
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environmental destruction.\textsuperscript{101} It focused largely on the environmental consequences of Canadian mining practices.\textsuperscript{102} Photos of the tour were posted on the Canadian Youth Climate Coalition’s website and a link was provided to a video of the tour on YouTube.\textsuperscript{103} The event was covered on websites such as CBC, the Council of Canadians and the Toronto Media Co-op.\textsuperscript{104}

**Public Awareness Events/Workshops**

Most public awareness events were collaborations between several eNGOs. WWF Canada, Équiterre, and La Fédération des coopératives du Nouveau-Québec Quebec installed a life size statue of a polar bear made of ice in Toronto to raise awareness about the urgency of action on climate change.\textsuperscript{105} The statue was meant to be interactive and the public was encouraged to touch the bear, in order to symbolize the ability of all to affect climate change.\textsuperscript{106} “This is a visceral way to bring the interactions between humans and climate together” commented Zoë Caron of WWF.\textsuperscript{107}

Climate Action Network Canada coordinated a number of public awareness events. A number of events took place prior to the summit. The event “From Copenhagen, to Cochabamba, Toronto and Cancun: Building the movement for climate justice in Canada” was a workshop covering the international movement for climate justice and how individuals can get involved.\textsuperscript{108} A similar workshop called “What is climate justice?” also took place. Another workshop called “Keep the lights on in the climate century” focused on how to find more clean energy solutions. Some workshops focused on more local environmental issues, such as “Tar Sands Expansion Through Local Struggles” or “Tar Sands 101,” which was an educational opportunity to learn more about the issues of the tar sands.\textsuperscript{109} On 26 June 2010, they helped coordinate a march designed to raise awareness about climate action, starting off from the Greenpeace office in Toronto.\textsuperscript{110}

**Collaborative Efforts**

Many coalitions incorporated a large number of eNGOs, as they collaborated with each other and other NGOs. The “At The Table” Campaign was a major civil society initiative that encompassed
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\textsuperscript{103} Kimia Ghomeshi, “Toxic Toronto Rears Its Head to Greet the G8/G20,” Canadian Youth Climate Coalition, 8 July 2010. Date of Access: 9 January, 2011, \url{http://www.ourclimate.ca/wordpress/tag/climate-justiceg20toxic-tour-indigenous-rights-tar-sands-action/}.


many eNGOs, including WWF, Oxfam Canada, the Sierra Club of Canada, the Canadian Youth Climate Coalition, Amnesty International and Climate Action Network Canada. The “At The Table” Campaign aimed to improve public awareness through pages on the website such as “G8/G20 101.”

Climate change was one of their three priority issues. Like many of their member eNGOs, they called for a reduction in emissions and funding for developing nations. They also ran a number of public engagement activities, such as a Global Day of Action, a petition, protest campaign using pictures of G8 leaders and community dinners to educate individuals about the G8 issues and call for action.

Multiple NGOs also collaborated through TckTckTck, a global alliance of eNGOs and other groups working together to stimulate action on climate change. There are eNGOs represented all across the world, such as The Health and Environment Alliance of Belgium, Greenpeace International, Équiterre of Canada, WWF International, the US Climate Action Network, World Mayors Council on Climate Change, Conservation International, the Canadian Parks and Wilderness Society, and CARE Climate Change. They too put forward a list of specific demands for G8 and G20 leaders. Three of them focused on helping the world’s poor deal with climate change: deliver a minimum of USD30 billion that is urgently needed to help poorer countries adapt to climate change, design a new climate fund that will meet the needs of the poorest and most vulnerable people and help low income nations develop infrastructure strong enough to withstand floods, establish new farming methods for drier conditions, and expand adequate healthcare systems as diseases like malaria spread into new areas.

The other two demands were to place a price on pollution and to increase public investment in renewable energy and energy efficiency. Along with the At the Table Campaign, TckTckTck helped to organize a petition of over two million signatures to world leaders at the summit. During the summit, they provided regular updates from their media station, the “Fresh Air Center.”

**G8-Civil Society Initiatives**

Little was done in the way of direct engagement between eNGOs and the G8 at the Muskoka Summit. Most of the engagement took place before the summit, and this was in a more restricted capacity than at previous summits, such as the 2009 Summit in L’Aquila.
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Many eNGOs expressed frustration at the lack of a pre-summit G8 Environment Ministers meeting, an event that has occurred regularly at past summits — generally an opportunity for eNGOs to engage in dialogue with G8 ministers.\textsuperscript{121} Prior to the 2009 L’Aquila Summit, eNGOs such as WWF International and the International Union for the Conservation of the Environment were involved in the environment ministers meeting held in Siracusa, Italy.\textsuperscript{122} The Siracusa Charter, a product of this meeting that was widely endorsed by the eNGOs consulted, subsequently influenced developments at the actual G8 Summit.\textsuperscript{123} However, no such meeting was held prior to the Muskoka Summit.

There was a meeting of G8 Finance Ministers, Foreign Ministers, and Development Ministers, but Environment Ministers were left out. Dale Marshall of the David Suzuki Foundation was surprised at this decision: “[This decision] continues to build evidence...that Canada is not a leader when it comes to addressing the impact of climate change,” he commented.\textsuperscript{124} John Bennett, the director of the Sierra Club of Canada, felt that the failure to hold an Environment Ministers meeting was symptomatic of the priority given to environmental issues in general: “When you are at the bottom of the pile, its really hard to get any lower” he remarked.\textsuperscript{125}

Robert Fox, the Executive Director of Oxfam Canada, was highly critical of the Canadian government for not hosting such a meeting. [Canada] could have demonstrated leadership...that they have a plan moving forward and that they are encouraging other governments to do so as well” he said. By not having the environment ministers meet, they reinforced the impression among critics that they are not committed to serious action.”\textsuperscript{126} Although there was not an environment ministers meeting, some environmental groups did protest prior to the G8 Development Ministers’ meeting in Halifax.\textsuperscript{127}

Further frustrations about the lack of civil society incorporation occurred over the lack of media access provided to civil society groups during the summit. NGOs (including eNGOs) were kept out of the international media center and were instead given a space described as “isolated” and with “little access to media.”\textsuperscript{128} Furthermore, civil society groups were unable to book spaces for

official press conferences. This lack of media access is in contrast to civil society incorporation at past G8 summits. In L’Aquila, the Italian government provided civil society groups with space in the International Media Center.

The “People’s Summit,” held from June 18-20, served as the alternative summit for civil society groups. There were a number of eNGOs involved in this event. Greenpeace facilitated a panel discussion entitled, “Politics of the G8 and the G20: Toronto, Ottawa and the Planet.” Speakers included Canadian Member of Parliament Olivia Chow and Toronto City Councillor Adam Vaughan. Topics included the oil spill in the Gulf of Mexico and the tar sands in Canada, as well as the need for greater action on environmental issues at the upcoming summit.

Summit Outcomes

Continuing in the trend of recent summits, eNGOs were largely disappointed with the outcomes of the G8 Summit in Muskoka. At best, eNGO representatives cited the lack of retrenchment on existing commitments as a positive outcome. Kim Carstensen of the WWF Global Climate Initiative expressed that final outcome of the summit, the G8 Communiqué, lacked vision and was a complete regeneration of commitments from earlier summits and last year’s climate conference in Copenhagen. “The good news is that climate change is still on the agenda, and we’re not back-tracking from where we got to last year,” remarked Carstensen. “The bad news is that there is no new commitment to actually do what is needed.”

In a blog entry on the WWF Website on 28 June 2010, Zoë Caron wrote that the G8 Summit was “by no means revolutionary” on the issues of climate change, environment, biodiversity, or energy transformation. However, she commented that as a result of the summit, Canadians have been made more aware of the discrepancy between the urgency of environmental issues and the lagging response of political leaders.

Like WWF, most eNGOs did not have many positive things to say about the outcomes of the 2010 G8 Summit. Clare Demerse of The Pembina Institute echoed the words of Kim Cartensen,
saying that the summit declaration was “vague” and produced no “new meaningful commitments” to tackle climate change.138

Greenpeace had a number of specific criticisms: failure to commit to greenhouse gas admissions; inadequate steps on phasing out fossil fuel subsidies, the failure to lay down plans for a “green energy future” and inordinate focus on carbon capture and storage, nuclear power and biofuels at the expense of more important issues.139 Greenpeace spokesperson Kumi Naidoo commented on the failure of the summit to meet Greenpeace’s checklist items: “Greenpeace put forth four simple demands that the G8 leaders could have followed to stop catastrophic climate change….I see no leadership here, the G8 has failed again.”140

The David Suzuki Foundation found similar faults with the summit’s progress on environmental issues. Foundation representative Dale Marshall said that the reiteration of last year’s commitment to keep global warming below two degrees would be “meaningless without action” and that further steps were needed to reduce greenhouse gas emissions in the G8 countries. Without such actions, Marshall contends that “warming will be twice the dangerous threshold” and will devastate “many of the world’s people and species.”141

Équiterre, a Canadian eNGO, was very critical of Canada’s government. “The lack of progress since last year’s G8 is a clear indication that after having stalled climate action in Canada over the last four years, the Harper government has successfully stalled it at the G8 level as well,” commented Steven Guilbeault of Équiterre.142

Civil society coalitions that included eNGOs also commented on the summit’s outcomes. The At the Table Campaign also put out a press release related to the summit’s outcomes. Their main criticism on climate was that little was being done to provide funds to help the world’s poorest tackle climate change.143 On the Tcktcktck website, another collaboration civil society group, an article by representative Beka Economopoulos criticized the G8 for neglecting the issue of climate change.144 “While four paragraphs in the communiqué were devoted specifically to climate change…no new initiatives or specific actions were announced that might indicate a

sense of urgency amongst the G8 leadership” she wrote. She also criticized the G8 for lack of accountability, raising the issue of how the $30 billion promised for developing countries will be acquired and distributed.

To rectify their missteps at the G8 Summit, Economopoulous recommended that G8 leaders follow the recommendations outlined by Greenpeace USA in the document “Energy Revolution 2010,” released just prior to the summit.

**Public Policy Research Institutions (Think Tanks)**

Mahdi Hussein

Public policy research institutions or think tanks have dramatically increased since the 1980s and 90s. These institutions have not only experienced growth in number, but have also experienced growth in the scope and impact of their research. These global partnerships and networks are an instrumental mechanism for crafting and transferring information internationally, which policy makers and global leaders can use to fine-tune policies at both the national and international levels.

The prominent issues at the 36th annual summit in Muskoka, Ontario, Canada, were development, the global economy, the global climate, security and democracy. An additional theme examined by several think tanks is the relationship between the G8 and G20, contending that the G20 may be a more suitable environment to discuss certain substantial global issues.
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Summit Participation

Policy Papers, Press Statements and Utilization of the Media

The Centre for International Governance Innovation (CIGI) was extremely active in issuing daily updates and summaries via YouTube clips, as well as publishing coverage and providing analysis of the G8 summit.

The Brookings Institute, Carnegie Endowment and the Center for European Studies published articles analyzing the G20 summit but did not publish much work assessing the G8 Summit in Muskoka.

The Center for International Governance published articles and videos criticizing Prime Minister Harper’s comments on Iran’s nuclear proliferation and the accuracy of the Muskoka Accountability Report.\(^\text{154}\)

They also expressed concerns with the 7.3 Billion collected for the Muskoka Initiative,\(^\text{155}\) a critique of the Muskoka Accountability Report,\(^\text{156}\) alternative financing for G8 development commitments,\(^\text{157}\) the Doha Development Round \(^\text{158}\) and the reform of the United Nations Security Council.\(^\text{159}\)


CIGI published an article criticizing Prime Minister Harper for wrongly stating that Iran had “chosen to acquire [nuclear] weapons to threaten its neighbours.”\(^{160}\) This is erroneous because the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), the United Nations Security Council, and the G8 in its Muskoka Communiqué had not made the claim that Iran had chosen to acquire nuclear weapons.\(^{161}\)

Another concern was the effectiveness of the USD5.5 billion invested by the G8 countries for maternal health.\(^{162}\) The specifics of how the money would be spent to contribute to a sustainable reduction in maternal and child mortality were not available during the summit.\(^{163}\)

CIGI advocated for the increase of innovative alternative financing for G8 Development Commitments.\(^{164}\) As mentioned in the Muskoka Accountability Report, aid commitments made by G8 leaders are frequently not paid in full.\(^{165}\) As the advocacy group ONE indicates, according to figures from the Development Assistance Committee of the OECD, the G8 has provided funding for about 60% of its aid promises.\(^{166}\)


This produces a culture of skepticism of commitments created by world leaders.\textsuperscript{167} To increase the completion rate of aid promises, G8 countries such as Canada and the United States have utilized public-private partnerships.\textsuperscript{168} This leverages government investments with cooperate funds to construct roads, power plants and bridges.\textsuperscript{169}

Credible partners are instrumental for these programs and the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation have been vital in this regard.\textsuperscript{170} The Gates Foundation has a larger program budget than most states and the World Health Organization.\textsuperscript{171} The traditional donors — states, are in a decline, while new types of donors, NGOs, charities and transnational corporation are becoming necessary and substantial agents in development.\textsuperscript{172}

CIGI had also published a short-video clip critiquing the Muskoka Accountability Report.\textsuperscript{173} The main concern was that it was not submitted for third party/independent review.\textsuperscript{174} This causes

\begin{footnotes}
\end{footnotes}
skepticism about the complete accuracy of the report and also sets a dangerous precedent about the methodology of compiling future reports.\textsuperscript{175}

In the G8 Muskoka Declaration, language was added on bilateral and regional negotiations regarding the Doha Development Round.\textsuperscript{176} The G8 reaffirmed its commitment to free and open trade, which CIGI contends is only one part of the solution, as developing nations, especially in the G20 would want to see more done in terms of development.\textsuperscript{177} The Doha Development Round should be rethought, alongside the G20, and ultimately will be a different product than what was initially envisioned.\textsuperscript{178}

If by the end of the year, the progress is not significant on the Doha Development Round, the G8 reaffirmed their bilateral and regional alternatives for open trade.\textsuperscript{179} Prime Minister Harper provided the example of the strong economic integration of Canada and the European Union.\textsuperscript{180}

CIGI expressed concerns on the division of the agenda between the G8 and G20.\textsuperscript{181} The G8 focused its efforts on peace and security and the G20 focused on economic security.\textsuperscript{182, 183} This is


problematic as the G20 provides a venue for multilateral diplomacy that better represents the shift of power in the global system. With this, accompanies the need for United Nations Security Council reform to better reflect this change.

Summit Outcomes
Upon the Summit’s conclusion, the Brookings Institute and CIGI published articles, op-eds, and videos assessing the outcomes of the G8 Summit.

The Brookings Institute published an article critiquing the G8 Summit and questioned its necessity in contemporary politics. It also highlighted two “silver linings” from the G8 Summit. The first was a forum for the United States and the European Union to discuss their disagreements without the countries from the G20 being present. The second was the Muskoka Accountability Report. With a growing number of rising countries and an increase of global integration, creating a precedent for states to hold themselves accountable is a fundamental necessity.
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CIGI published an article from The Korean Times arguing that the G8 Summit was a failure in terms of maternal health.\textsuperscript{190} The commitments on maternal health are similar to the same commitments made in 1990 in the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs).\textsuperscript{191} Goal 4 was to reduce child mortality by two thirds, between 1990 and 2015.\textsuperscript{192} Goal 5 was to reduce by three-quarters, between 1990 and 2015, the maternal mortality ratio and to achieve by 2015, universal access to reproductive health.\textsuperscript{193} These goals are far from completion and when Prime Minister Stephen Harper reaffirmed similar commitments at the Muskoka Summit, it only reaffirmed failure.\textsuperscript{194}

CIGI had also published an article criticizing the effectiveness and necessity of new sanctions on Iran.\textsuperscript{195} At the end of June, Foreign Affairs Minister Lawrence Cannon held a highly publicized press conference indicating to Canadian journalists that Canada would impose new sanctions on Iran, in addition to the ones imposed by the G8 and UN Security Council.\textsuperscript{196} Both CIGI and the Globe and Mail concluded that this message was politically driven and intended to appease the Pro-Israeli political constituencies of the Canadian population.\textsuperscript{197}

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
Human Rights Organizations
Sima Atri

Civil Society groups, largely composed of non-governmental organizations, have emerged globally as important promoters of human rights. Organizations like Amnesty International, Global Witness, and Human Rights Watch seek to promote human rights through advocacy work, the mobilization of public opinion, the investigation of abuses, and the provision of assistance to victims. A number of human rights-focused civil society organizations and took an active role at the G8 Summit. They organized protests, engaged communities, and drafted press releases. However, human rights groups were generally disappointed with the summit, both in the commitments as outlined in the final communiqué, the lack of accountability, and the lack of civil society inclusion at the summit.

Summit Participation

Policy Papers, Press Statements and Utilization of the Media

Human rights organizations were especially active in releasing policy papers and statements before, during, and after the summit. A number of organizations were especially active: Amnesty International, Human Rights Watch and the Global Call to Action Against Poverty.

Amnesty International put out a number of important press releases in the lead-up to the G8 summit. Its first, titled “G8: time for bold actions, not just promises” released on 24 June 2010, welcomed G8 states’ commitments to transparency and accountability, but expressed worry that the Millennium Development Goals would not be met. This release also stressed the need for a central role for a human rights approach to the Millennium Development Goals efforts. In the midst of the summit on 27 June 2010, Amnesty released a statement noting that peaceful protests suffered amidst heavy security measures at the G8. On 30 June 2010, Amnesty called on the Prime Minister and Premier of Ontario, through an open letter, to engage in a summit security review. Amnesty International released the statement on behalf of the organization’s 80,000 Canadian members.

Human Rights Watch also released a number of public statements around issues pertaining to the G8 summit. On 23 April 2010, Human Rights Watch released an open letter to Honorable
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Beverley Oda, Canada’s Minister of International Cooperation, asking Canada to make maternal and child health a priority for the summit. The organization called this “critical for achieving progress on the Millennium Development Goals and for protecting fundamental human rights.”

A separate letter noted the additional importance of functioning accountability systems for health care issues. Finally, Human Rights Watch also called for leaders to address the human rights crisis in Burma. The letter addressed to G8 foreign ministers called for the summit to take up accountability for war crimes and targeted sanctions, while calling for free and fair elections.

The Global Call to Action Against Poverty (GCAP), a leading human rights organization, was also an important source of news and analysis. GCAP is the world’s largest civil society movement and calls for an end to poverty and inequality. GCAP was one of the only sources to comment on President Obama’s surprise announcement at the G8. The American President outlined his vision for a new US policy on global development, “strengthening efforts to reduce global poverty, promote economic growth, and enhance the impact and results-based approach of American foreign aid.” GCAP also started a successful Facebook campaign calling for the G8 to “show us the money.” As will be further discussed, GCAP released a press statement on 27 June 2010 denouncing the “media apartheid” at the G8 and G20 summits. This press release was also signed by other civil society organizations and coalitions including Make Poverty History, Canadian Federation of Students, Greenpeace, OXFAM, and WWF. Many other organizations released statements on this issue.

Many other organizations were vocal at the conclusion of the summits, noting its successes and failures in relation to the global human rights movement. Save the Children, an organization that strives to help every child “attain the right to survival, protection, development, and participation,” welcomed the child and maternal health initiative. They did however note that the “absence of the Gleneagles commitments from the final communiqué was a major


omission.” Women Deliver, a global advocacy organization that promotes health as both a human right and primary necessity for sustainable development had positive feedback, noting that the Canadian Prime Minister “should be proud of his efforts to lead and champion child and maternal health.”

Bono’s ONE Campaign argued that although the G8’s commitments were “an honest promise,” they added that they were “also a weak promise.” GCAP was largely disappointed, as the declarations made no reference to the 2005 Gleneagles commitments and promised relatively little compared to the amount spent on summit security. Finally, Make Poverty History, the coalition of over 70 organizations “saw little in the final outcome document to justify the existence of the G8 and the costs it took to hold the meeting.”

**Summit Protests**

The Toronto Community Mobilization Network was instrumental in coordinating and marketing protests in Toronto around G8 and G20 issues. The Network describes itself as an “education, outreach and infrastructure body that supports community-based mobilizations.” The Network coordinated rallies, marches, street parties, and tent cities between 21-27 June 2010. Their messages largely revolved around an end to the violence caused on Indigenous and impoverished communities as well as women, by the G8. Thousands of demonstrators took over Toronto’s downtown core chanting human rights-related slogans.

The Council of Canadians was also very active in organizing a number of protests across Canada. The Council of Canadians is Canada’s largest citizen’s organization and promotes progressive policies on issues of social and economic concern to Canadians. Arguing that the summits did not make sense politically, democratically, or financially, the Council of Canadians organized protests, editorials, and speeches. The Council also challenged threats to civil liberties by handing out earplugs to combat the police’s acoustic devices. The Council additionally organized public
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216 The Council of Canadians was also very active in organizing a number of protests across Canada. The Council of Canadians is Canada’s largest citizen’s organization and promotes progressive policies on issues of social and economic concern to Canadians. Arguing that the summits did not make sense politically, democratically, or financially, the Council of Canadians organized protests, editorials, and speeches. The Council also challenged threats to civil liberties by handing out earplugs to combat the police’s acoustic devices. The Council additionally organized public
education workshops at the People’s Summit. During the G8 Summit, members of the Council protested in a canoe near the summit with a “scrap the summit” message.\textsuperscript{220}

There were also a number of protests specifically targeting certain human rights issues. For example, a group organized a “March 4 Freedom” calling on individuals to mobilize against the invitation of President Meles Zenawi of Ethiopia to the G8.\textsuperscript{221} Protesters object to the invitation of an alleged war criminal. A larger protest, partially coordinated by the Toronto Community Mobilization Network and indigenous groups, occurred 24 June 2010 to demonstrate against the G8 and G20 meetings.\textsuperscript{222}

\textbf{Collaborative Efforts}

Human rights organizations played an important role in the People Summit preceding the G8. One of the five main themes of the People Summit focused on human rights, featuring panels and debates.\textsuperscript{223} Human rights organizations also informed the public through their press releases and policy documents.

\textbf{Summit Outcomes}

Canadian Prime Minister Steven Harper placed special emphasis on accountability at the 2010 Muskoka Summit. A Canadian authored Accountability Report attempted to trace states fulfillment of select past commitments.\textsuperscript{224} The Honourable Lawrence Cannon, Minister of Foreign Affairs, also noted that Canada’s G8 website, would serve as an essential forum for citizen engagement.\textsuperscript{225}

Nevertheless, civil society had mostly negative feedback for the Canadian-led G8 summit. The G8 Research Group noted that Canada was under a lot of pressure as chair of the G8 as many of the Gleneagles and other summit commitments were due in 2010.\textsuperscript{226} However, Amnesty International Secretary General Alex Neve argued that “both summits failed to give the sustained commitment to human rights we’d like to see.”\textsuperscript{227} The ONE Campaign provides solid analysis. It states that although “the G8 promised to ‘ensure follow-up’ on the conclusions and recommendations of the [Accountability] report, they shunned the first opportunity to actually implement them through the development of a robust, transparent and accountable Muskoka

There was also little mention of civil society except as part of the programmatic and funding end in the G8 Communiqué.²²⁹

However, negative comments did not only result from broken commitments. Many human rights organizations argued that the security measures at the summit impeded individuals rights to free expression. In a press release from Amnesty International, the organization noted that “security measures that were put in place in Toronto in the lead up to the summit...narrowed the space for civic expression,” and many therefore felt apprehensive and fearful of participating in protests.²³⁰ In addition, the separation of the mainstream media and the conference delegates from civil society groups was considered a serious blow to accountability and human rights. Condemned as “media apartheid” by Kumi Naidoo, co-chair of the GCAP,²³¹ and a number of other civil society actors,²³² Amnesty International’s Alex Neve called the segregation “troubling.”²³³

The lack of pre-summit meetings enabling discussion with civil society further limited human rights organizations access to delegates. Many organizations noted that the summits suffered from the lack of expertise as civil society groups were denied access to background briefing. Dennis Howlett, Canadian coordinator of Make Poverty History stated, “it [was] an indication that the Canadian government [did] not recognize the important role civil society plays.”²³⁴ The summits were therefore deemed a step backwards by the majority of civil society actors.

²²⁸ Nora Coghlan, On accountability, G8 fails to walk the walk, ONE blog, 16 July 2010. Date of Access: 2 January 2011. http://www.one.org/blog/category/2010-g8g20/
Faith-Based Organizations
Sue Hammond and Carmen Celestini

Faith-based communities offer highly diverse religious and spiritual teachings, and have varied methods of outreach. The United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS (UNAIDS) defines faith-based organizations as:

- Informal social groups or local faith communities (e.g. — women’s groups, youth groups);
- Formal worshipping communities with an organized, hierarchal structure (e.g. — Muslim, Buddhist, Christian), and sub-divisions of organized religion (e.g. — Shi’ite Islam, Zen Buddhism, Protestant Christianity);
- Independent faith-influenced non-governmental organizations (e.g. — Islamic Relief, World Religions Summit). 235

A great number of faith-based organizations—as part of their guiding principles—advocate on behalf of communities that are directly or indirectly affected by the inequities of global society. Such organizations include the World Religions Summit, Tear Fund, KAIROS, Development and Peace, and World Vision.

The World Religions Summit is an interfaith initiative that actively seeks peaceful, positive action on issues such as poverty, climate change, nuclear disarmament and armed conflict. 236

Faith-based organizations were very active and responsive to the G8 summit in June 2010. These actions include organizing conferences and summits, such as the InterFaith Leaders Summit in Winnipeg, organized by the Canadian Council of Churches. It brought together 80 worldwide faith organization leaders, representing 20 countries and nine religious traditions. 237 They also were active mobilizing protests, releasing statements and press releases calling for action from the G8 leaders, as well as in response to the G8 Leaders Summit Announcement. Faith-based organizations will utilize infant and child mortality rates, and maternal mortality rates, along with statistics from sources such as the Human Development Index (HDI), to gauge levels of success or failure of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) as set out by the G8/G20 countries.

Summit Participation

Policy Papers, Press Statements, and Utilization of the Media

On 23 June 2010, the eve of the G8 Summit, eighty senior leaders of the world’s religions and faith-based groups representing over 20 countries and 47 different denominations gathered for the 2010 World Religions Summit (WRS) to urge G8/G20 world leaders to honor the Millennium Development Goals. Those of the Aboriginal, Baha’i, Christian, Muslim, Jewish, Sikh, Shinto and Hindu religious traditions convened at the University of Winnipeg in Manitoba, Canada. Faith leaders issued a statement—“A Time for Inspired Leadership”—to the G8 leaders, urging them to “consider first the dehumanizing scourge of poverty and injustice,” and to encourage “care for our common environment, the Earth.”

Key issues addressed at the WRS included: poverty, caring for the Earth, and investing in peace.

Christian Aid is an organization that lobbies for climate change issues, HIV/AIDS and malaria aid, and human rights. It is a Christian organization comprised of churches in Britain and Ireland. In September 2010, they released a Policy Report analyzing the progress of the G8 and G20 leaders on the MDG’s specifically on the goals for ending poverty.

A key issue at the WRS was to address poverty, most especially with respect to women and children, indigenous peoples, and those with disabilities. Participants cited the growing gap between the rich and the poor as a key factor leading to food deprivation and mortality rates amongst the poorest. Some expectations of wealthy countries by global faith leaders are to: do all possible to reach MDGs; invest 0.7% of gross national income in development assistance; cancel debts of Highly Indebted Poor Countries (HIPCs) without the implementation of regressive conditions; halt capital flight from poor to rich countries; make poverty reduction a priority; educate female children; and combat corruption.

Another critical issue considered by the faith leaders was “careful stewardship of the Earth.” Concern over long-lasting and harmful damage to the environment resulted in an expectation that world leaders should take decisive action now. Seeing the interdependency of the Earth’s systems


as a “unified whole,” faith leaders rested most responsibility for climate change in the laps of industrialized nations: “The strategy of promoting endless development and high consumption lifestyles must be challenged.”

Faith leaders at the WRS expect that world leaders will ensure that wealthier countries implement concrete plans to ensure that global average temperatures do not increase more than two degrees Celsius from the pre-industrial levels; and in developing countries, that rich and poor nations work together to protect valued lands and keep industrial pollution at a minimum.

Save the Children released a Call for Action for the G8 and G20 Leaders to fulfill their promises for the Maternal and Child Health MDGs. They urged the leaders to fulfill their pledges on nutrition and hunger, commitment to a global action plan for maternal, newborn and child survival, to deliver on their promises to Africa. In conjunction with this Call for Action, they also released a Policy Brief on The EU and child Survival, and a second on what the government of the UK must do in 2010 to meet MDGs.

The final key issue addressed at the WRS was that of investing in peace. With a belief in the collective interdependence of humanity, faith leaders noted a highly disproportionate amount of violent conflict in the world’s poorest countries, and clarified that it is the responsibility of all to ensure that this violence is minimized. It was noted that NATO countries account for over 2/3 of global military spending—USD1.464 billion—“more than 20 times the annual world financial contributions to Official Development Assistance.” Faith leaders also cited nuclear proliferation and the production of other weapons of mass destruction as grave dangers to humanity. Those attending the WRS presented the following expectations of world leaders: put an end to the arms race with a goal toward global disarmament; control production of small arms; invest in creation of a culture of peace; promote peace-building with the inclusion of religious communities; and, to stop ethnic cleansing and the suppression of minorities.

Pre-Summit Protests/Public Awareness Events/Workshops

The 2010 World Religions Summit marks the first to host approximately one hundred youth. The spiritually eclectic youth from across Canada attended GEN-Y to G-8: A Multifaith Dinner to

---


Inspire Change, and engaged in a panel discussion. To promote social activism, each young person was challenged to make or inspire positive change in some way. Most took up the challenge. More importantly, youth inclusion at the WRS prepares young people to take part in critical decision-making processes with respect to global issues and to effectively address G8 leaders in the future.

KAIROS: Canadian Ecumenical Justice Initiatives is a faith-based ecumenical organization that effects social change through advocacy, education and research programs in the fields of: ecological justice; economic justice, energy and extraction, human rights, just and sustainable livelihoods, and indigenous peoples.

KAIROS participated in the 2010 World Religions Summit (Manitoba), the G8/G20 Peoples’ Summit (Toronto), and organized the Climate Justice Tour of Canada (Canada-wide), an initiative to bring forward the voices of those most affected by climate change. During the Climate of Justice Tour, KAIROS speakers Naty Atz Sunc (Guatemala) and Isaiah Kipyegon Toroitich (Kenya), Francois Pihaatae (Tahiti) and Fred Sangris (Yellowknife) addressed the impact of climate change in their communities and engaged in dialogue with Canadians about how to achieve solutions.

Development and Peace (Caritas Canada) is the official international development organization of the Catholic Church in Canada and a member of Caritas Internationalis. Development and Peace works with their partners—International Cooperation for Development and Solidarity (CIDSE), the Canadian Council for International Cooperation (CCIC), and KAIROS—to support partners in the Global South who “promote alternatives to unfair social, political, and economic structures.” Development and Peace spends much time communicating with Canadian Ministers of Parliament to improve the situation of the Global South. In addition, Development and Peace has hosted numerous public events to raise Canadians’ awareness and to inspire Ministers to take action.

**Collaborative Efforts**

Development and Peace works with their partners—International Cooperation for Development and Solidarity (CIDSE), the Canadian Council for International Cooperation (CCIC), and KAIROS—to support partners in the Global South who “promote alternatives to unfair social, political, and economic structures.”

KAIROS assisted in planning of the 2010 World Religions Summit, organized the Climate of Justice Tour in collaboration with the Canadian Youth Climate Coalition, and participated in the 2010 Peoples’ Summit. This faith-based organization was an active part of the Canadian campaign which called for the implementation of a Financial Transaction Tax ("Robin Hood Tax")

---


256 Sara Stratton, Education and Campaigns Coordinator, KAIROS, email message to author, January 11, 2011.


Tax”), a tax that “would shift the burden of crisis resolution from the general public to the financial sector…making the tax system fairer.”

Summit Outcomes

Tearfund is a Christian faith-based organization that has created a global network of churches to assist those in the international community suffering from poverty. The organization also provides disaster relief and recovery, and advocacy.

According to Paul Cook, Tearfund’s advocacy director, “The G8 leaders have missed a golden opportunity to join the dots on some of the causes of global poverty, by failing to address the need for clean water and basic sanitation in the commitment to maternal health,” issues which the organization links directly to infant and maternal health. Cook is also concerned with a lack of a plan of action to deliver on the 2015 Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), believing that G8 commitments are simply a “repackaging of old commitments” by the “G8 rich club.” Tearfund suggests that MDGs should be monitored country-by-country between 2010 and 2015 with the involvement of civil society.

According to KAIROS, urgent global issues were largely ignored by G8 leaders at the 2010 G8 Summit in Huntsville, Ontario. Maternal health, a key issue for many faith-based organizations, was allocated inadequate resources to address an urgent problem. Efforts and voices of non-governmental organizations were shelved or largely ignored. KAIROS also denounces aggressive policing of the many peaceful G8 protestors that took place in Toronto, Canada, (in reaction to a few violent vandals) which kept many who wanted to speak out at home and detracted from important issues, severely calling into question Canadian civil liberties.

World Vision is a Christian relief, advocacy and development organization working with children, families, and communities to overcome poverty and injustice. World Vision found the
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2010 G8 Summit to be “tainted by low promises and low expectations.”\(^{270}\) Robert Zachritz, director of advocacy for World Vision in the U.S., commends G8 leaders for acknowledging the lack of progress being made with respect to preventable child deaths, however: “Last year, 8.8 million children and at least 350,000 women died, most from preventable causes.”\(^{271}\) In addition, World Vision cites that “[m]ore than 170 million children under the age of five are stunted or severely wasted—conditions that can permanently damage their physical and mental development.”\(^{272}\) Zachritz states that the sense of urgency (among G8 leaders) is missing with regard to child and maternal health issues\(^ {273}\) and the allocation of USD5 billion—to be amortized over a five-year period—is not enough to effectively address this urgent global issue.\(^ {274}\) In reaction to the G8 announcements, World Vision released a response acknowledging the steps taken by the leaders, but explaining why it was not enough to meet the demands of maternal and child health globally.\(^ {275}\)

The G8 verdict from Development and Peace is one of great disappointment. World leaders at the 2010 G8 Summit failed to recognize food sovereignty (the right of people to define their own food and agricultural systems)\(^ {276}\) as a key issue to ensure food security. Development and Peace believes that policies adopted by the G8 leaders will undermine what could otherwise be “a sustainable, inclusive, and long-term approach to both the issues of climate change and food security.”\(^ {277}\) Executive Director Michael Casey hoped that Canada would take the opportunity to urge other G8 leaders to increase their support for small-scale agricultural activities, especially in the Global South. Canada did not fulfill this expectation. As a result, large-scale agro-business (most especially the agro-fuel business which requires high-yield soya or corn crops which consume great amounts of land) in the Global South will be permitted to expand without interruption, destabilizing the environment, displacing populations and endangering the livelihoods of a countless number of sustainable farmers. The poorest countries in the world will be gravely affected by this decision as will global environment.\(^ {278,279}\)

Overall, faith-based organizations were dissatisfied with the 2010 G8 summit pledge toward improving global maternal and child health, the lack of urgency with respect climate control, and

---
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failure to find ecologically acceptable alternatives to large-scale agro-business in the Global South. In addition, faith-based organizations have indicated great concern with the arbitrary reduction of Canadian civil liberties during the summit period, which silenced the voices of many social activists.

Faith-based organizations continue to urge the G8 leaders to understand the magnitude and urgency of the gravest issues, emphasizing the interconnectedness of humanity and the environment, and our collective responsibility toward both. Importantly, KAIROS’s recommendation of a nominal Financial Transaction Tax (FTT) on global business transactions could fund many of the 2015 Millennium Development Goals set out.
Celebrity Activists
Julian Dyer

Since the 2005 Gleneagles summit, celebrity activists have used their fame to attract media attention to their issues of choice, and to enjoy significant access to G8 leaders. In particular, Bob Geldof and Bono have attempted to solidify their position as anti-poverty campaigners through ONE, the advocacy group they jointly founded in 2002, and though collaboration with other activists, such as economist Jeffrey Sachs to educate the public on the issues of poverty reduction. This has drawn criticism from those who claim that popularizing complex issues that vary across circumstances and counter-intuitive solutions into simple messages for the public can have negative consequences. This critique has been disputed, citing the many celebrities becoming very well informed on the issues, and their ability to bring the issues they champion to the attention of the “soft media” and an audience academic discourse is unable to reach. Despite the debate concerning the benefits of their actions, the media attention they control and their freedom to champion causes on moral grounds, unconstrained by vested interests, have made celebrity activists significant actors at G8 summit.

Prior to the Muskoka summit of June 2010, the organization ONE, and its chief campaigners Bono and Bob Geldof worked, with support from Jeffrey Sachs, to bring issues of poverty and development to the attention of the public. While their earlier advocacy popularized the image of desperation — the LiveAid concerts were widely criticised for stereotyping all Africans as poor and starving — their message is now very different. The theme of their advocacy is now very much the “African Century,” projecting the potential for progress driven by the people of the developing world, if given the key support they require now. ONE has also worked to remind the public of commitments made at earlier summits and to shame those who have not honoured their pledges.

Summit Participation

Policy Papers, Press Statements and Utilization of Media
On 23 June 2010, a number of celebrity activists, including Scarlett Johansson, Naomi Campbell, Dame Judi Dench, Rio Ferdinand, Joanna Lumley, Angelique Kidjo, Celine Dion and long-time celebrity maternal health campaigner and fashion icon Christy Turlington Burns, signed an open letter to G8 leaders from the White Ribbon Alliance for Safe Motherhood (WRA) demanding action to improve maternal health. The letter aims to bring the extent of the problem to the attention of leaders, and remind the international community of previous pledges: “The international community has promised action, Millennium Development Goal 4 and 5 aim to reduce child deaths by two thirds and maternal deaths by three quarters by 2015, yet it’s these goals that have made the least progress and we still have a very, very long way to go in making them happen.”

The letter requested a doubling of G8 aid for Maternal, Newborn and Child Health, specifically targeted at training health professionals and eliminating user fees for women
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and children. Burns also contributed to the special African Century edition of the Globe and Mail to make a plea for maternal health.

The weight of celebrity publicity was immediately successful in bringing the issue to the attention of G8 leaders, and helping activists gain direct access to leaders. On 23 June 2010, UK Deputy Prime Minister Nick Clegg met with Christy Turlington Burns, and declared “Addressing maternal and infant mortality is the government’s top priority for international development in 2010. The UK has challenged other countries to lower the shocking and shameful levels of maternal mortality through setting ambitious goals at the G8 this week.” This was taken up by British PM David Cameron, who established a GBP5 million fund to help British midwives train their counterparts in the developing world, to set an example and pressure other G8 nations, in collaboration with Canada’s Steven Harper, prior to the Muskoka Summit.

Bob Geldof and Bono were made celebrity guest editors of Toronto’s The Globe and Mail newspaper, releasing a special Africa-focused edition on May 10 titled The African Century, focusing on the continent’s potential. Bono announced, “Our aim in this special edition is to crack down on a few stereotypes and showcase the opportunities surrounding the African continent, not just the problems.” Among the guest contributors were Steven Lewis, Kofi Annan, Carla Bruni, Ban Ki-moon, Rober Zoellick, Angelique Kidjo and Christy Turlington Burns. Bono and Geldof’s editorial described Africa as “an unshackled continent. This century is being invented before our eyes, and Africa is the site of the greatest transformation. Canada, and the other G8 and G20 countries that gather in June, had better recognize opportunity knocking — before it knocks them over.”

Geldof and Bono describe a continent of great potential, but only if G8 countries act now. They listed some of the threats to African prosperity, “The recent recession has … lowered investment in the continent, … donor countries, such as France, Italy and Germany, have reneged on … aid commitments made at the historic 2005 G8 summit in Gleneagles. This jeopardizes the tremendous strides made in Africa …” as well as the benefits of African progress to the rest of the world. At the same time they issued a subtle threat to the G8 countries; that if they miss this opportunity for fruitful partnership with Africa, its potential wealth will be lost to the Chinese. “Africa, with its vast geographic advantages, … resources … and population, is an unstoppable force. It is also an attractive place to invest. One country has been quick to see Africa’s promise: Chinese direct investment in the continent is accelerating. … And yet Canada’s government has made Africa less of a priority.”

Celebrity activists have used their media access to shame G8 leaders by drawing attention to unfulfilled past promises. ONE singled out Italian leader Silvio Berlusconi for individual criticism, requesting that he be removed from the G8. “Italian Prime Minister Berlusconi is unique among the G8 because he is the only leader to have actually consistently cut effective aid
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to Africa since he personally signed the G8 communiqué with his own hand in 2005. This campaign is not a criticism of Italy or of Italian people, it is a criticism of one man who has broken his promise to an entire continent.\footnote{About Hurl Berl, ONE International. http://www.one.org/international/actnow/hurlberl/about.html}

Celebrity philanthropist Bill Gates joined the campaign of shame, using a USD30 million donation to highlight the failure of G8 nations to honour their commitments. At the 2009 L’Aquila summit, the G8 launched the L’Aquila Food Security Initiative, committing USD22 billion to sustainable agricultural development, yet at the time Gates made his donation, only USD875 million had been contributed by developed nations.\footnote{MacAskill, Ewan. Bill Gates donates £20m to kickstart fund for farmers. The Guardian, April 22 2010 http://www.guardian.co.uk/technology/2010/apr/22/bill-gates-farmers-aid}

\textit{Pre-Summit Protests/Public Awareness Events/Workshops}

The issue of maternal health has been actively promoted at this G8 by a number of celebrities, supporting the White Ribbon Alliance and other organizations such as Oxfam, Save the Children and Amnesty International. Maternal health has also figured prominently in the education campaigns of ONE.

\textit{G8-Civil Society Initiatives}

The high profile of celebrity activists gives them an advantage over other activists in gaining access to G8 leaders, such as US President Barack Obama agreeing to an interview with Bono, published in the African Century edition of the Globe and Mail, edited by Bono and Bob Geldof. The interview featured many promising commitments by Obama, reaffirming that “Development is a strategic and moral imperative for the United States,” and that development is important to his administration, declaring that it was “[their] intention to elevate development so that it stands alongside defence and diplomacy as an equal.”\footnote{Barack n’ Roll. The Globe and Mail. Toronto, Ont: May 10, 2010 pg. A3} However, Obama did not make any measurable commitments, or concrete progress he hoped to make at the Muskoka Summit. There were vague references to “bring additional sources of capital to the table” and “to translate principles into action,” but Bono did not press Obama to make substantial commitments, or to take a stronger stance on G8 nations fulfilling pledges.

The ability of celebrities to gain direct access to leaders is a powerful tool, unavailable to the majority of other campaigners. In comparison to Bob Geldof’s interview with Silvio Berlusconi prior to the 2009 L’Aquila Summit, where Geldof made the most of his opportunity to shame Berlusconi and demand that he acknowledge his country’s failure to honour promises of aid, Bono tamely made little of this opportunity.

\textit{Summit Outcomes}

On 2 July 2010, ONE released a detailed analysis of the results of the G8 summit, and the communiqué released. In general, ONE was pleased with commitments made, but was critical of a worrying reluctance to pressure countries to honour commitments; “their focus on accountability stopped short of calling on countries who have not yet delivered on commitments to do so urgently.”\footnote{Todd, Eloise. Berlusconi in Geldof Interview: “Africa, I’m Sorry”. ONE International Blog. July 6, 2009. http://www.one.org/blog/2009/07/06/berlusconi-in-geldof-interview-africa-im-sorry/} The communiqué mentioned the Gleneagles commitments only as a
baseline for measuring contributions, but “stopped short of calling for donors to follow through
on unmet Gleneagles commitments.” 294 ONE’s analysis is also sceptical of the aspirational
commitments in the communique: “G8 commitments range from “aspirational” statements of
policy to more measurable and trackable pledges, with aspirational commitments being the most
difficult to track and monitor. For most commitments, the report avoids commenting on the
ultimate delivery and does not specifically mention where individual donors are off-track to meet
any of the commitments.” The lack of detail in commitments, the tendency towards vague
“aspirational” commitments and reluctance to pressure members to honour commitments meant
ONE was generally critical of G8 accountability.295

ONE welcomed action on maternal and newborn health, with the G8 announcing the Muskoka
Initiative, and USD5 billion additional funding, expected to prevent 1.3 million child deaths,
64,000 maternal deaths and to provide access to family planning for 12 million couples.

A cynical assessment of the action taken towards maternal health is that it has been able to divert
attention away from the larger commitments that have been broken. The USD5 billion (of which
ONE is uncertain how much will be new funding) may have eased the pressure on leaders who
collectively are lagging behind on the Gleneagles commitment to increase aid by USD50 billion.
The media attention attracted to the issue by celebrity advocacy may have been co-opted to
portray action, while continuing to renge on larger commitments.296
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Service-Based Humanitarian Organizations
Laura Correa Ochoa

Humanitarian organizations are difficult to conceptualize in a single definition as they encompass a wide range of interests, topics, activities, and areas of operation. However, there are certain characteristics that can be attributed to all of them. They are often philanthropic in nature, in the sense they attempt to relieve people from a particular crisis that causes destruction, suffering or violates human rights.\(^{297}\)

It is important to distinguish between human rights group and service based humanitarian organizations. While the former focuses on advocating protection of human rights and ensuring compliance by governments and non-state actors; the latter, tries to provide a particular service during and after times of natural disasters, violence and/or disease. It is also important to differentiate between service-based humanitarian organizations that have some governmental or state affiliation like USAID or Europe Aid; those that depend on multilateral aid like UNDP; and those that are private or voluntary like Oxfam and the International Red Cross.

Some of the major humanitarian organizations that operate in a global scale include Oxfam, the International Red Cross, Doctors Without Borders, Habitat for Humanity, and CARE. Since numerous humanitarian organizations have international objectives, they play a fundamental role in representing the most vulnerable and attempt to influence G8 summits by demanding greater commitment and aid for healthcare, food security, sustainability and/or education.

Over the last decade the International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies have urged the G8 to “invest in a more long term action” to support food security prevention programs as well as in climate related risks.\(^{298}\) In previous years, Doctors Without Borders (MSF) have urged the G8 to “provide access to affordable medicines,”\(^ {299}\) and “to take action to save most vulnerable in food crisis.”\(^ {300}\) On 2 June 2003, MSF criticized the G8 Action Plan on Health, saying that they sacrifice “solutions to increase access to essential medicines in favour of G8 political and commercial interests.”\(^ {301}\) They further urged the G8 to do more in the “battle against

AIDS.” Similarly, throughout the years, Oxfam has championed initiatives to improve access and provision of health and education. In recent years they have also called for greater G8 action to deal with Climate Change as it harms “harvests, livelihoods, health and safety.” Moreover, after the last Summit, Oxfam declared that “Canada 2010 is the end of the road for the G8 — all the promises they have made are due. They have 12 short months to avoid being remembered as the ones who let the poor and the planet die.”

**Summit Participation**

On 24 June 2010, CARE called G8 countries to “show leadership on saving the lives of mothers and children.” They pointed out that of all MDG’s there has been less improvement in “reducing maternal and child mortality and achieving universal access to reproductive health.” They also demanded that the G8 doubled its commitment to USD4 billion to accelerate the progress of these two MDG’s. Similarly, World Vision also pointed out that despite the current economic situation, G8 leaders should still make global poverty, and particularly child and maternal health part of their agenda. They also congratulated G8 and G20 members for making progress concerning the Gleneagles commitments and the US government for maintaining its promises regarding HIV/AIDS. On 25 June 2010, Oxfam expressed its skepticism about the maternal mortality announcement, arguing that this could simply be “a distraction from their broken promises” after their fail to meet their commitment to increase aid to USD50 billion by 2010, by over USD20 billion. They further remarked that any “new” money dedicated to maternal health will have to come out of other “vital” sectors. In other words, “Unless aid increases, African children will be paying for their mothers’ healthcare by sacrificing their education.”

On 27 June 2010, Oxfam with other civil society groups, including: the Canadian Labour Congress, the Ontario Federation of Labour, the Council of Canadians, Greenpeace and the Canadian Federation of Students, “organized a peaceful demonstration in Toronto on Saturday which attracted over 10,000 people.” Oxfam criticized the violence that occurred after since it detracted attention from the important issues being discussed at the Summits “at a time when millions of lives are hanging in the balance as a result of ongoing poverty around the globe.”
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24 June 2010, Oxfam G8 “Big heads” were displayed in Huntsville naked and pregnant to “illustrate the G8’s failure to keep their promises to poor people around the world.” The next day, the G8 Big Heads portrayed G8 leaders as tourists instead of powerful leaders.

On 24 June 2010, Bill Nighy — actor and Oxfam Global Ambassador — at a media breakfast in Toronto spoke out against G8 “broken promises” from the 2005 Gleneagles Summit. He was accompanied by Dorothy Ngoma, a Malawian nurse and activist, who urged G8 leaders to “improve health services for mothers-to-be and prevent the deaths of 350,000 women and girls who die in pregnancy and childbirth each year.”

On 27 April 2010, CARE expressed its support for Muskoka’s Maternal Health initiative but emphasized that the “primary focus must be on the lives of these women and not solely on controversial issues pertaining to maternal health.” They also stressed the need for “a comprehensive and all-encompassing strategy on maternal health,” as reinforced by Canadians Civil Society Organizations during the Civil G8 meeting in Vancouver.

CARE International, in partnership with other international organizations that work on maternal, newborn and child health programs, is calling on G8 nations to commit to a doubling of resources to $4 billion annually to accelerate progress on MDGs 4 & 5, including investing in health systems that deliver quality interventions along the continuum of care in communities, clinics and hospitals. These investments would leverage the $30 billion in total global funding needed by 2015 to support maternal, newborn and child health care interventions.

On 22 June 2010, Doctors Without Borders pointed out that in order to improve mother and child health in the developing world, they first need to “address malnutrition and establish new sustainable funding sources to combat this treatable and preventable condition.” They also stated that NGOs cannot be expected to combat malnutrition alone and that “donor governments need to step up to fill the gap and help the most-affected countries follow lifesaving nutrition programs that have been successfully implemented in countries like Mexico, Thailand, and Brazil.”

**Summit Outcomes**

During the Muskoka Summit G8 leaders acknowledged various demands made by humanitarian organizations. The G8 reiterated its commitments to fight hunger and poverty through research and “agricultural productivity.” Leaders also reiterated their support efforts to provide “universal access to prevention, treatment, care and support with respect to HIV/AIDS,” as well as initiatives to eradication of polio and elimination of NTD’s.
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The G8 further emphasized its desire to improve maternal and child health through the Muskoka Initiative, “a comprehensive and integrated approach to accelerate progress towards MDGs 4 and 5 that will significantly reduce the number of maternal, newborn and under five child deaths in developing countries.” G8 leaders decided to provide USD5 billion of additional funding to “accelerate progress on MDG’s 4 and 5.”

After the Summit CARE commended the Canadian government for prioritizing maternal, newborn, and child health. However, the organization expressed “its disappointment with G8 leaders who, as a group, failed to step forward and back the Canadian ‘Muskoka Initiative’ with adequate funds for lifesaving maternal, newborn and child health care interventions worldwide.” They are also disappointed with the amount of money committed to the initiative.

On a similar note, Oxfam criticized G8 leaders “for their failure to deliver on their promises and for trying to divert attention by cobbled together a small initiative for maternal and child health.” They further pointed out that “the G8’s failure will leave a sad legacy of kids out of school, denied medicines for the sick, and no food for the hungry.”

On 16 July 2010, Oxfam also pointed out that in order to meet the 2001 promise to provide “universal HIV and AIDS treatment, care and prevention by 2010” international donors need to contribute US$20 billion to the Global Fund. After the International AIDS conference in Vienna, Oxfam declared that “world leaders made no real commitments to ensure universal access to prevention, treatment and care for AIDS,” they noted that this is reminiscent of the G8 Muskoka Summit where leaders “admitted that this year they will break their promise to provide universal access.”

---

Philanthropic Foundations
Sara Lee

Philanthropic foundations are charitable organizations that raise funds to address wide range of issues, including; global maternal health, poverty reduction, access to education, access to information technology, environmental protection, sustainable development, women’s rights and access to clean drinking water. While many philanthropic organizations operate domestically, the most relevant to the G8 are the international philanthropic groups, founded in rich countries, to benefit those in underdeveloped countries. The major philanthropic organizations examined in this report are: the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation (BMGF); the William J. Clinton Foundation; ONE, founded by musician and activist Bono; and the Rockefeller Foundation.

Philanthropic organizations do not tend to initiate their own projects, but fund existing projects and partnerships. As such, they are crucial sources of income for other civil society organizations such as CARE, Alliance for a Green Revolution in Africa, and Save the Children, and also UN subsidiaries such as the World Food Program. Philanthropic organizations also function as advocacy networks to raise awareness and support for certain issues, rather than their own programs.

Summit Participation
On 22 April 2010, in a joint press release with representatives of the governments of the United States, South Korea, Spain, and Canada, Bill Gates of the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation (BMGF) announced the creation of a global trust fund for the impoverished small farmers of the developing world, particularly in sub-Saharan Africa and Southeast Asia.322 This would boost funds for existing BMGF partners, such as the Alliance for a Green Revolution in Africa (AGRA). Gates expressed a firm belief that funding small farmers, and connecting them with contracts with the World Food Program (WFP) for distribution in their own countries was a step towards development, sustainability, and ending global poverty.

Preceding the 25-29 June 2010 G8 Muskoka Summit, the attention of philanthropic organizations was focused largely on maternal health and childcare. In a 7 June 2010 press release, Melinda Gates announced the BMGF’s commitment to maternal, newborn, and child health and nutrition, particularly in developing nations.323 More specifically, Gates reiterated the BMGF’s pledge of USD1.5 billion over the next 5 years to fund the training of health workers, and research on efficient contraceptives, birthing practices, and breastfeeding advocacy. The foundation began with a USD94 million dollar pledge to India, and USD60 million to Ethiopia. In a 24 June 2010 blog post, in light of the upcoming G8 summit, Gates again emphasized the BMGF’s “[Commitment] to Women and Children.” She urged developed nations of the world not to cut developmental assistance, but to “move forward.”324

On 18 June 2010, Judith Rosin, president of the Rockefeller Foundation wrote Keith H. Christie, the G8 Foreign Affairs Sous-Sherpa for Canada, applauding “Canada’s leadership in the UN and G8 initiative on Maternal, Newborn and Under-Five Child Health.” She also referred to the Rockefeller Foundation’s “e-Health” initiative to incorporate mobile phones into plans addressing maternal and child health. Rodin concluded by pledging the Rockefeller Foundation’s support for the global health effort outlined in the G8’s Muskoka Initiative documentation.

Directly preceding the summit, ONE continuously and directly pressured G8 leaders to address the following issues: firstly maternal and child health, and accountability in these issues, and secondly, mutually accountable partnership with Africa based on good governance, trade and investment. On 23 June 2010, ONE presented a petition of over 58,000 names to Prime Minister Stephen Harper in Ottawa, Canada. The petition called for “3.5 million new health workers to help mothers and children.” The petition especially urged G8 for “a robust maternal and health initiative that includes accountability measures.”

Other major philanthropic organizations, such as the William J. Clinton Foundation, appear not to have made direct statements to the G8 or participating countries.

The G8 Muskoka Initiative regarding maternal health can be regarded as a response to the pressures of the previously outlined statements by the BMGF, the Rockefeller Foundation, and ONE. The Muskoka Initiative focuses on widespread delivery of cost-effective and scientifically-proven maternal healthcare, particularly in poverty-stricken areas. This also includes maternal and child nutrition, and prevention and effective treatment of HIV/AIDS and malaria. The G8 pledged USD5.0 billion over the next five years for the Muskoka Initiative. The importance of access to accurate information, and sharing of technological innovation were also emphasized. Each G8 member was left to fulfill this initiative in bilateral interactions, multilateral organizations, and/or civil society organizations as they pleased.

In the Muskoka Initiative, the G8 also aimed to improve accountability and transparency through more regular monitoring, reporting, and evaluation of G8 compliance. The goal of the Muskoka Initiative was the same as the 2001 Millennium Development Goals 4 and 5: “reduce by two-thirds between 1990 and 2015, the under-five mortality rate; ii) reduce by three-quarters, also between 1990 and 2015, the maternal mortality ratio; and iii) achieve, by 2015, universal access to reproductive health.”

**Summit Outcomes**

Following the conclusion of the summit, on 16 July 2010, ONE expressed discontent over the Muskoka Initiative regarding maternal health. ONE pointed out that the Muskoka Initiative had failed to specify how the USD5.0 billion was to be delivered, and left little transparency for
monitoring and accountability. According to ONE, the Muskoka Initiative was unsatisfactorily “too general.”

On 5 August 2010, the BMGF announced that The Living Proof Project, which had previously been overseen by the BMGF, was to be transferred to the care of ONE.\textsuperscript{330} The Living Proof Project was largely a ‘storytelling’ multimedia project BMGF expressed the desire for The Living Proof Project to expand under ONE’s oversight. The BMGF urged readers to support ONE, in order to pressure G8 and G20 nations to honour the commitments made at the Muskoka Summit, particularly regarding international development.

Other philanthropic organizations appear to have been fairly inactive in terms of direct response to the G8 Muskoka Summit.

Trade Unions
Laura Correa Ochoa

Trade unions are organizations that represent workers. Their main objective is to improve employment conditions while campaigning for beneficial laws and policies. Although most labour unions tend to operate at a local or national level, through the globalization of markets and financial systems, some trade unions have adopted a more international agenda. Trade unions in international character often advocate for more equal and open terms of trade between developed and developing countries, removal of tariffs, and in cases protection for a regional based union.

In 1997, the International Confederation of Free Trade unions (now ITUC) were first invited to take part in a G8 summit, where it called for a “social partnership” to fight unemployment and provide job security.331 Today the ITUC represents 176 million workers in 151 different countries and territories. Due to the global financial crisis, in 2009 the ITUC pressed G8 leaders for employment opportunities and economic recovery.332 Nevertheless, over the last decade the role of trade unions regarding G8 initiatives and advocacy has expanded to other sectors. Trade unions have pressed G8 leaders for a “fairer distribution of the benefits of globalisation.” Amongst these “stronger social protection in developing and emerging countries.”333 Similarly, they have call for actions for extended debt relief in the developing world, as well as greater actions in managing Global Food Crisis.335 Health has also become a top priority for labour unions, African Trade Unions have demanded greater commitments from G8 leaders in regards to HIV/AIDS, calling for a G8 AIDS working group.336 In the past the European Trade Union Confederations has also demanded greater “responsibility” from G8 leaders in terms of Climate Change initiatives.337

Summit Participation

Policy Papers, Press Statements and Utilization of Media
Prior to the Summit, different trade unions around the world expressed their concerns, demands and expectations from G8 leaders. On 19 June 2010, at the World Conference on Sustainability by ICEM and IMF, Global Trade unions pressed for “environmental, social and economic sustainability” from G8/G20 leaders. Labour activists and unionists also demanded secure jobs and social safety nets. Monica Veloso, vice president of the National Confederation of Metalworkers in Brazil, also emphasized the importance of workers having a say “in the public

regulation of the economy.” The conference produced the declaration “Fighting Together-Fighting for a Sustainable Future” which calls G8/G20 leaders to strengthen “financial, environmental and labour regulations” and ensure “that these are included in any trade agreements, along with effective enforcement mechanisms.” The declaration also demanded the implementation of the Robin Hood Tax, the creation of “green jobs,” a comprehensive agreement on greenhouse gases, and the inclusion of labour unions and civil society groups “in bilateral and multilateral trade agreements.”

In the official Global Unions’ Statement to the G8/G20 Ontario Summits—which includes ITUC, TUAC and BWI — they called G8 leaders to “meet aid commitments and support the MDG’s” while developing a framework to monitor “delivery of commitments.” They also demanded that the G8 “invest in public services,” make job opportunities the core of development strategies, and create “quality employment” for women. In terms of healthcare, they call G8 member to increase resources to achieve HIV/AIDS Universal Access and “replenish the Global Fund for AIDS, TB and Malaria.” Global Unions also called G8/G20 leaders to stop the IMF’s promotion of “austere adjustment policies, together with conditions on loans that require the deregulation of labour markets and the weakening of worker protection.” They also called G8 members to make a real commitment to achieve Education For All, as it is “a key factor to sustain recovery.” They also pointed out that several numerous G8 members have reduced their aid budgets, Italy by 31.1 percent and Germany by 12 percent, making it difficult to achieve this initiative. Furthermore, Global Unions pressured G8 leaders “to combat tax evasion and tax heavens.”

One of the major initiatives of trade unions during and leading up to the Summit revolved around HIV/AIDS. In the last week of March, trade unions and civil society groups launched a campaign to pressure Canadian Prime Minister Stephen Harper to formulate a comprehensive plan to “achieve Universal Access to HIV & AIDS Prevention, Treatment, Care and Support,” by targeting Canadian Embassies around the world. Some of the organizations that participated include the African Regional Organization of the International Trade Union Confederation (ITUC-Africa) and the Canadian Labour Congress (CLC) who lobbied in both Africa and Canada. The Global Union AIDS Programme (GUAP) and the Global ITUC also participated and called “countries to broaden the scope of the campaign beyond Africa.” Unions argue that alleviating HIV/AIDS is necessary to produce “social and economic stability,” since the majority of infected people are of working age.

On 24 March 2010, the three main trade unions in South Africa, COSATU, NACTU, and FEDUSA along with representatives from a multi-faith civil society network and World AIDS Campaign met with the Canadian Embassy to discuss HIV/AIDS issues. They not only demanded action for Universal Access, but also emphasized the ILO Decent Work objectives and its Global

---

Jobs Pact. This was further reinforced by Indian trade unions who promoted the campaign via Facebook called “I support Universal Access to HIV & AIDS Services.”

**Summit Outcomes**

For years, economic matters have been one of the top priorities of G8 members. In the 2010 Muskoka Summit G8 members reiterated their continued commitment to “free and open markets,” as well as to the Doha Development Agenda. G8 leaders also stated that they “promote liberalization of trade and investment under the WTO, through the national reduction of barriers, as well as through bilateral and regional negotiations.” They also promise to reduce or eliminate trade barriers for environmental goods and services and create jobs in this field.

In terms of health, G8 leaders reaffirm their commitments to achieve Universal Access goals, to eradicate polio and mitigate NTD’s. One of the focus of the Summit was maternal, newborn and child health, where, through the Muskoka Initiative, G8 members promised an additional $5 billion, over a period of five years. G8 leaders also declared that food security would also be one of their commitments in the upcoming years and highlighted the need to increase investment in developing countries as a developmental tool.

Despite the reaffirmations and commitments, on 6 July 2010 the Trade Union Advisory Committee (TUAC) and the International Trade Union Confederation (ITUC) stated that “there is a shortfall of $50bn by 2010 to meet the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) in 2015.” Nevertheless, they welcome G8’s initiative to cancel Haiti’s International debt with Financial Institutions and commitments for improving child mortality and maternal health.

---


Educational Campaigns
Rameez Mahmood

In the words of Nelson Mandela, “Education is the most powerful weapon we can use to change the world.”\(^{345}\) Mandela’s suggestion is easily perceptible given that the richest countries in the world are often knowledge-based economies. Education has always been the backdrop to success and ingenuity in the modern world. This truth resides in the numbers. If all children left school with basic reading skills, 171 million people could be annexed from poverty.\(^{346}\) A child whose mother cannot read or write is 50% more likely to die before reaching the age of 5.\(^{347}\) An educated girl in Africa is three times less likely to contract HIV/AIDS.\(^{348}\) An argument for the pre-eminence of knowledge production over poverty reduction can be made.

Today, approximately 72 million children\(^{349}\) and 266 million\(^{350}\) adolescents are not in school. 759 million children out of school\(^{352}\) and 871 illiterate adults at the start of the century.\(^{353}\) In 2000, the achievement of Universal Primary Education (UPE) was established as the second Millennium Development Goal (MDG). Also in 2000, the Education for All (EFA) goals were stipulated at the World Education Forum, which 180 countries endorsed. Some of the proclaimed commitments included achieving universal access to education for children and adults; removing the gender disparity in education accessibility; and improving the quality of education.\(^{354}\)

Within this framework, the recipient states were charged with the task of developing education policies appropriate for their country, while having a transparent and democratic process, inclusive of donors and civil society organizations.\(^{355}\) In 2002, the Fast Tract Initiative (EFA-FTI) became the pragmatic framework for achieving EFA. It created a “compact” between poor...
countries and their donors, aiming for the efficient delivery of resources, technical know-how, and budgeting. It also tried to pave the way towards a greater level of accountability.  

The G8 meetings and states have spearheaded large achievements towards EFA goals. In fact, the FTI framework was established by the G8 in 2002. Civil Society has similarly been at the forefront of providing and advocating for UPE along with the broader EFA goals. The first substantial step towards addressing issues of education worldwide was at the 1990 World Conference on Education for All, which saw heavy Civil Society participation. From there on, the campaign for education goals within the NGO sector became typified by the creation of the international, coalitional NGO, The Global Campaign for Education, formed in 1999. It incorporates large international NGOs such as Oxfam, Education International, Save the Children, and Action Aid. John Gaventa and Marjorie Mayo of the University of Sussex hail it as “one of the longest-standing global campaigns on a poverty-related issue, ... able to build and maintain a strong, diverse, inclusive coalition across many countries and across many layers and levels of policymaking and policy implementation.”

GCE has played a pivotal role in education advocacy to the G8. In 2002, for example, at the Kananaskis Summit in Canada, they lobbied, encouraged, and reported on the endorsement of the FTI Education for All initiative. They published a report documenting what has been agreed upon and what more needs to be done. Another significant effort by the GCE has been the annual Global Action Week. It has consisted of varying activities such as protests, lobbying efforts, symposiums and press conferences, with the intention of pointing governments’ worldwide education needs. Just in the first Action Week, events were held in over a 100 countries. The event’s statement proclaimed “We are watching you” to rich countries.

In the 2008 Action Week, they garnered a crowd of nine million people, along with notable celebrities, to demand EFA. They have also published reports on various topics related to EFA.
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goals since their inception. Over the year they have garnered substantial support from celebrities and important personalities on their campaigns, including Nelson Mandela, Graca Machel, Jessica Alba, Hillary Clinton, Zinedine Zidane, Ban Ki-Moon, Shakira, and Queen Rania of Jordan.\textsuperscript{365-366}

International NGOs covering education development have been an integral part of GCE. Nonetheless, some of them have acted independently in campaigning for EFA. Education International has the Hands Up for Education campaign that directs attention to the needs of education in countries, following the global economic crisis, for instance.\textsuperscript{367} Oxfam, Save the Children, and Action Aid International, all have published numerous reports on topics relevant to education, particularly collecting valuable data on the ground. This report shall focus on the EFA goals, as those are endorsed by the G8. Particular attention will be given to GCE because it subsumes much of the activism and advocacy on realizing EFA goals.

**Summit Participation**

In January 2010, GCE published the 2009 School Reports that detailed the progress of 22 rich countries, encompassing the G8, on EFA goals. The publication, designed as a school report card, gave letter grades to the state leaders on certain key goals such as focusing on girls’ education.\textsuperscript{368} PM Harper, for instance, received a ‘C’ grade, being told, “He is far from reaching the international Pearson target for ODA, and seems to be losing interest in Africa.”\textsuperscript{369}

The popular 1GOAL campaign was launched in October 2009, with FIFA being a key supporter. It aimed to rally mass support from soccer fans worldwide behind the GCE. At the launch, the heads of states of UK, South Africa, Spain, and Netherlands spoke in support of the campaign. Soccer players such as Zidane, Giberto Silva, and Thierry Henry also endorsed the campaign.\textsuperscript{370} At the African Cup of Nations 1GOAL, was highly active, with radio and TV broadcasts, advertisements, and numerous soccer ambassadors. The campaign has been headed by Queen Rania of Jordan. Prior to the G8 Summit, ActionAid also held international events in support of 1GOAL. In Bangladesh, ActionAid organized soccer games in 31 districts, and held post-match signature-gatherings for the campaign. At the same time, they published a toolkit helping finance ministers and activists create effective financing strategies for achieving the EFA goals.\textsuperscript{371}

On the eve of the Muskoka G8, Oxfam, in a press release, warned of massive shortcomings in delivering on promises of aid made by the G8. Not referring to education aid specifically, they identified a shortfall of $20 billion, based on the targets set at the 2005 Gleneagles Summit.\textsuperscript{372}

---

\textsuperscript{365} 1GOAL (Johannesburg) 1 December 2010. Date of Access: 2 January 2011. \url{http://www.join1goal.org/}


\textsuperscript{371} ActionAid backs 1GOAL Campaign Calling for More Funding and Greater Prioritisation for Education, Action Aid (Johannesburg) 7 June 2010. Date of Access: 2 February 2011. \url{http://www.actionaid.org/pages.aspx?PageID=34&ItemID=560}

\textsuperscript{372} “Bounced Cheques Undermine G8’s Credibility” Oxfam Canada. Date of Access: 9 January, 2011. \url{http://www.oxfam.ca/node/2092}
Mark Fried, Oxfam’s G8 spokesperson commented, “The $20 billion owed to poor men and women is just 0.0006% of the gross national income of G8 countries, yet is enough to put every child in school.”

GCE, and other campaigns focusing solely on education, did not have events directed specifically towards the G8. Campaigns and NGOs reacted following the G8 and G20 Summits.

**Summit Outcomes**

GCE published a press release following the G8 and G20 Summits. It expressed deep disappointment in both the G8 and G20 in not addressing education in any substantial way. No new commitments were made to remunerate for the shortcomings. GCE had also hoped to see development on a global financial tax, which also saw no progress. The press release looked forward to a better outcome at the November Seoul G20 Summit.

GCE did not hold campaigns or events directly addressing the G8 or G20 in 2010. It did, however, remain highly active following the Canadian G8 and G20. Just following the Summits, GCE published its annual 2010 School Reports, grading the progress of world leaders on key education landmarks. Canada was ranked 9th overall. They also released ‘Back to School?’ in September, a substantial report outlining the worst places a child could go to school, as well as achievements necessary for the realized of EFA goals. It ranked Somalia and the earthquake-devastated Haiti as the worst places for a child to be a student. It noted key successes such as Kenya, where only 0.1 million children are out of school down from 3.1 million in 1999. The report made a case for the primacy of education over simply poverty reduction, argued that any sustainable solution towards escaping poverty necessitates the education of children.

In September 2010, the UN Summit for achieving the MDG goals was held. Major NGOs, state actors, International Financial Institutions, and many from the private sector were invited for numerous formal meetings and roundtables to assess the realities of achieving MDGs by 2015, and looking ahead to what must be accomplished. Numerous major publications were produced in coordination with state and non-state actors. GCE’s 1GOAL campaign had an individual event addressing the Summit. It called attention to the success of the 1GOAL campaign so far and stipulated future needs. Queen Rania of Jordan addressed the Summit, alongside a speech delivered by 1GOAL’s 12-year-old ambassador, Nthabiseng, from Soweto. Eighteen million signatures of 1GOAL supporters, gathered since the inception of the campaign, were presented at

---

the Summit. Another event, the High-Level Round Table, brought together global leaders to form a nexus on addressing EFA goals and establishing a link between education and development. Save the Children was one of the key organizers of the event.381

Also in September, GCE released a press release on International Literacy Day 2010, urging world leaders to concentrate on the EFA goal of halving the number of illiterate individuals in the world. Highlighting data from the 2010 UNESCO MDG Monitoring Report, released in February, they said that the goal would be missed by a large margin, with 710 million still illiterate people in 2015, should business remain as usual for donor countries.382 A GCE press release, calling attention to the lasting effects of the global financial crisis, raised alarms in November. It used the example of Mozambique where the government has started to consider cutting funding from the education sector.383 It warned that if donor countries did not step up their commitments to EFA-FTI, more poor countries will be forced to shut down schools and dismiss teachers, as FTI funding dries. The press release argues that at the current rate, there might even be more children out of school in 2015, than there are at present.