Intensified mass labor migration, especially since the 1970s, is one of the key results of the neo-liberal economic policies (e.g. structural adjustment programs, privatization, deregulation, economic liberalization) imposed on, or pursued by, Asian countries in the past 30 years.\(^1\)

The rise of the neo-liberal globalization paradigm in the 1970s was no accident – these policies emerged and became consolidated at the 7th (1973-1979) “Tokyo Round” of negotiations of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT), the precursor of the World Trade Organization (WTO). The Tokyo Round coincided with the emergence of the “Washington Consensus” (a global economic model based on the principles of privatization, free trade, deregulation – i.e. neo-liberalism), and the rise of giant transnational corporations. For the first time since it was formed in 1947, GATT began to deal with “non-tariff barriers” (policies and practices of governments that impact on trade) in the 1980s. The Uruguay Round that followed (1986-1994) expanded the scope of the subjects dramatically, and included services for the first time in the scope of trade negotiations.\(^2\)

Thirty years later, many Asian countries have become the biggest exporters of migrant labor, particularly the Philippines, Indonesia, Sri Lanka, and Bangladesh. Neo-liberal policies implemented by these countries have caused or exacerbated chronic unemployment, loss or collapse of livelihoods, unrealistically low wages, intensified marginalization
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Over 1,000 migrant workers participate in the July 24, 2005 rally against the WTO. Hong Kong, 2004.
of women, unsustainable or failed rural sectors, tremendous debt burden, chronic trade and investment imbalances, volatile currencies, removal or reduction of social services and protections – i.e. the undermining of the social, livelihood, food and job security of the people, especially the laboring and marginalized sectors. Asian countries have become more vulnerable to social unrest and economic crises originating from within and outside the country. Reflecting increasing neo-liberal economic integration, financial and currency shocks have become more persistent and continental/global in scope, especially since the mid-1990s. The financial crisis in Asia in 1997 and the debt and currency crises in Latin America (Argentina, Brazil, Uruguay) in 2002 are prime examples.

Neo-liberal globalization has become one of the major “push factors” spurring millions of displaced workers and women in Asia to become part of a global, highly mobile, job-seeking army of migrant laborers. Governments, employers, recruiters and the commercial sector, realizing the enormous economic “advantages”, opportunities and markets created by the import-export of migrants, have built billion-dollar industries capitalizing on the labor trade.

The primary gains from labor export seen by sending governments are the significant reduction in national unemployment, and the huge and quick foreign currency inflows from remittances. For example, in the Philippines, annual migrants’ remittances are four to eight times the total annual foreign direct investments (FDI) into the country. As a result, sending governments in Asia have grown dependent on labor export, making this one of the cornerstones of their national development plan.

This dependency has also resulted in mendicant or distorted fiscal and economic priorities and policies in the form of systematic reduction or removal of allocations to basic social services, reserving the biggest slice of the national budget to debt servicing, complacency or neglect in developing local jobs and productive capacity, weaker national fiscal discipline and reliance on deficit spending, and unabated corruption – since, anyway, remittances can directly or indirectly fill in the financial gaps/imbalance. On top of this, the government can also directly borrow from migrants by floating government debt instruments, for example, the USD1,000 “Erap” (treasury) bonds offered by the Philippine Treasury in January 1999, which targeted overseas Filipinos in order to fulfill the promise to IMF to reduce the government’s USD2.3 billion deficit; in 2002, the Philippine Department of Foreign Affairs again sought funds from migrants with the launch of the “OFW bonds.”

This dependency means that sending governments ultimately abandon their responsibility to the people by relying on migrants to seek jobs overseas (instead of the government ensuring that local jobs are generated) and by relying on migrants to provide housing, education, health, public facilities and other basic social needs of their families and communities. At the international level, financial/development institutions and governments are now going further by suggesting to tap migrants’ remittances to finance development. Thus, instead of fulfilling their international development commitments under the United Nation’s Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), some policy-makers suggest using migrants’ remittances to ‘finance development’, instead of the promised ODAs and FDIs that are not coming in.
By the 1990s, more Asian sending governments have become more aggressive (even cut-throat) in pursuing labor export policies to capture bigger slices of the migrant labor market worldwide. Many countries such as Indonesia, Vietnam, the Philippines, and Bangladesh have national development plans or annual targets on the number of workers to be exported. In keeping with this goal, sending governments, with the help of international and intergovernmental institutions, have focused their attention on “systematizing” and “managing” labor migration, instead of ensuring rights protection.

Conversely, there are intense pressures on receiving countries to achieve or maintain global competitiveness. Unfortunately, this is usually done by sacrificing basic social services, the human rights and welfare of the local workers and the people. Economic restructuring (towards more service-oriented and advanced manufacturing), erosion/reduction of wages/benefits, labor informalization, and intensification of labor (to keep up with high cost of living) are some of the key ‘pull factors’ that draw to, and distribute cheap migrant labor among, the Asian receiving countries. As a result, South Korea, Hong Kong, Japan, Malaysia, Thailand, Taiwan, Singapore and the Middle East have become major receiving countries. In these countries, the “3-D” (dirty, dangerous, demeaning) jobs in factories, plantations, fishery, construction, domestic work, elderly/child care, etc. have been increasingly relegated to imported, lower-paid migrant labor, as local workers try to pursue the more high-paying and preferred jobs, usually in advanced industries and the service sectors.

In these host countries, economic restructuring and high cost/standards of living have intensified pressures on local women and even the elder segment of the population to enter or re-enter the labor force. This created big markets for imported workers in domestic help, care giving, or similar services, thus explaining the explosion in the number of women migrant domestic workers across Asia. The entertainment sector also expanded due to increased tourism flows, expatriate communities (including foreign military troops), and a more affluent local population. This has drawn a large number of migrant entertainers, including significant numbers of women, to most of these Asian host countries. The sex industry also grew in the past 30 years in the major host countries; unfortunately, this growth also meant that many women have been trafficked for sexual exploitation or forced labor to countries such as Japan, Taiwan, South Korea, and Thailand.

**Situation of Asian migrant workers**

Importation of migrant labor is an important competitiveness strategy in a neo-liberal global system. Current estimates by the Migrant Forum in Asia (MFA) puts the number of laboring migrants in Asia at around 30 million. They are engaged in low-paying, vulnerable, oppressed and exploitative jobs; half of these are women. Tens of millions of migrant workers in Asia are also undocumented (i.e. without visa or valid work permits); many have been trafficked for sex and/or forced labor.

Receiving countries have grown reliant on imported laborers not only because they can be cheaper replacements for local labor, but also due to the fact that host governments are able to deny migrant workers many fundamental labor, civil, political, social and human rights and benefits based on visa status and other vulnerabilities – which they can’t do to local workers (citizens). Thus, most of the Asian importing countries exclude, restrict or deny foreign workers such important rights and benefits as job mobility, right to organize or bargain, social mobility, education, marriage/family/child-bearing rights, legal/visa status, access to social services, representation, voting, etc.

In many Asian receiving countries, there are no standard employment contracts for migrant workers. If migrants are mentioned in national laws/policies, it is generally in the context of social/political restrictions, immigration controls, national security or criminalization. Even in the sending countries, the labor laws normally don’t cover or mention workers deployed abroad. If migrants are mentioned in the laws or policies of sending countries, or in bilateral agreements, it is normally in the context of the labor trade – opening up markets of migrant labor, and not on protecting/ensuring migrants’ rights.

In all Asian receiving countries, migrant workers have no institutionalized channel for consultation or representation on policies directly affecting them, including national economic development plans and foreign debt payment policies. Even in their own countries, which depend
on remittances for economic survival, migrants have no or very limited channels for representation or consultation in national policy/decision-making.4

There are also very few, and mostly outdated, international minimum standards explicitly protecting migrant workers. In the absence of these, there is hardly any minimum standard upon which national legislations and practices must conform. Thus, migration policies across Asian countries are very patchy and not human rights-oriented. The most coherent and updated instrument, the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of their Families, adopted by the UN General Assembly in 1990, only came into force as an international treaty in July 2003. The treaty so far has very limited applicability – less than 30 countries have ratified it worldwide, of which only three are from Asia (Philippines, Sri Lanka, and Timor Leste).

All these contribute in making migrants a cheaper, more vulnerable, controllable and exploitable workforce in a global neo-liberal system. Migrant workers become unitized and commodified tools of production – traded as cheaply as possible, and stripped of their families, rights and humanity. In this context, it is not surprising to see widespread and systemic abuses, violence, discrimination, violation of basic human and labor rights, marginalization and oppression of migrants. The convergence of class, gender and race oppressions compound and intensify migrants’ systemic vulnerability and exploitation.
Responses by migrants and advocates

As workers and women, migrants are a powerful social sector. Migrants and advocates have, in the past 30 years, campaigned against the violations, abuses, vulnerabilities and multiple oppressions. Asian migrant support groups, NGOs and networks were formed as early as the 1970s. Many of these continue until today to provide redress/support services, conduct public campaigns, lobby, advocate, organize, unionize, build networks, train, and develop social and economic alternatives.

Migrants’ trade unions were formed as early as the 1980s – with the Asian Domestic Workers Union (ADWU) in Hong Kong being perhaps the first registered trade union of foreign domestic workers in Asia. Unionization of migrants, including their self-representation in ILO, national, and international forums, continue to expand today.

Asian migrants’ networks have also continued to grow since they were first established in the mid-1980s. The MFA, established in 1994, and currently composed of over 260 members from 20 countries in Asia, is the biggest and most representative network of migrant groups, NGOs and advocates in Asia. The migrant movement in Asia is the most established and organized among the global regions.

MFA, AMC and migrant groups/NGOs in Asia work with global partners, particularly Migrants’ Rights International (MRI). Together, they highlight migrants’ issues, agendas and positions at Asian and international forums, including the UN Commission on Human Rights, ILO, UNIFEM, Global Commission on International Migration (GCIM) and UN world summits.

Migration, the WTO and neo-liberalism

As neo-liberal economic policy is the root of the exploitative labor trade, Asian migrant groups and advocates have been actively involved in challenging the neo-liberal paradigm for over two decades. In 1994, MFA consolidated its perspectives on development and globalization in its Principles of Unity. Since then, MFA, AMC and migrant partners have engaged in a number of responses, forums and actions pertaining to migration, neo-liberal globalization and development. These include actions on APEC, ASEM, IMF/WB and the WTO. In September 1995, for example, at the 4th World Conference on Women in Beijing, China, the press release and statement of the NGO Migrant Caucus highlighted the impact of globalization, structural adjustment programs and unsustainable development models on women and migration of women.

At MFA’s Regional Conferences on Migration (RCM), participants have issued a number of statements highlighting the negative impacts of globalization, deregulation and structural adjustment programs imposed by the IMF, WB and WTO. In particular, these impacts are seen as among the root causes of mass labor migration. MFA also presented its perspectives on development and globalization in its 1994 “Principles of Unity”.

Migrant groups joined local advocates in Hong Kong to demonstrate and campaign against the IMF and WB during the 52nd IMF-WB ministerial meeting held there in 1997. More recently, MRI and migrant partners strengthened solidarity against the WTO and the General Agreement on Trade in Services (GATS) during the 5th WTO Ministerial Meeting in Cancun, Mexico in 2003, where they joined alternative forums protesting the WTO agenda.

This commitment against the WTO and neoliberal policies was further strengthened in Hong Kong, where migrants, trade, debt and development advocates came together to issue the Hong Kong Declaration at the “Regional Conference on WTO, Development & Migration: Building Migrant and People’s Solidarity in Challenging Neoliberal Development & WTO” (see below).

WTO 6th Ministerial Conference

The WTO was established in 1995 to replace GATT, and become the international institution to push for the global neo-liberal “free trade” agenda, including the power to regulate, set rules/policies, arbitrate disputes, impose sanctions, administer and enforce free trade regimes.

GATS, also a product of the Uruguay Round and adopted in 1994, was included as one of the trade agreements to be administered and enforced by the WTO. There are now at least 23 trade and trade-
related agreements under the WTO. Other key agreements that are of most concern to social advocates are: Agreement on Agriculture (AoA), Non-Agricultural Market Access (NAMA), Trade-related aspects of intellectual property rights (TRIPS), trade-related investment measures (TRIMS).

Since the Uruguay Round and until today, civil society and social movements have risen up against the WTO and its various agreements because of their actual and potential devastating impacts on the human rights, social security, lives and livelihoods of the ordinary people. Consistent with the mandate of WTO, the core agenda of these agreements are how to advance the interests of the developed countries, and the global trans-national corporations (TNCs).

In 1999, the WTO held its 3rd Ministerial Conference in Seattle, USA (“Millennium Round”). At the Seattle Ministerial, developed countries attempted to advance their corporate and neo-liberal agendas especially in agriculture; but powerful civil society protests and strong disagreements by many WTO members (especially developing countries) led to the collapse of the negotiations.

To make up for lost ground, the WTO convened its 4th Ministerial (“Development Round”) in 2001 in Doha, Qatar – where there was very little civil society presence and public attention. The developed countries (e.g. US, European Union, Canada and Japan) succeeded in intimidating the developed countries into adopting the Doha Development Agenda focusing on agriculture (AoA), services (GATS), manufacturing (NAMA), intellectual property rights (TRIPS), investments (TRIMS), etc.

The WTO planned to conclude the Doha Round at the 5th Ministerial in 2003 in Cancun, Mexico. But the massive public protests, the strong disagreements
between the developing and developed countries (resulting in the walkout of many of the G-90 countries from the negotiations), and the self-sacrifice of Korean farmer Lee Kyunghae, led to the collapse of the Cancun Ministerial.

But the collapse of the Cancun meeting did not spell the end of WTO. The WTO General Council met in July 2004 in Geneva – involving only 40 out of the 140+ member-countries. It came out with the “July Framework” which basically overrode the agendas rejected in Cancun. In a widely-criticized “institutional coup,” the General Council resurrected the collapsed negotiations; worse, the July Framework contained far worse proposals and principles than those discussed and rejected at the Cancun Ministerial.

It is essentially the July Framework that will be brought to the 6th WTO Ministerial Conference scheduled in Hong Kong in December 2005. The MC6 will attempt to conclude the Doha Round of negotiations by finalizing the deals on AoA, GATS and NAMA, among others.

Migrants and advocates believe that the oppression and vulnerabilities of migrants will be exacerbated if AoA, NAMA and GATS are concluded at the MC6, especially along the lines of the July Framework. An AoA deal, which keeps the developed world’s massive tariffs and subsidies on their agricultural products, and perpetuate dumping of cheaper agricultural products on developing countries, will result in the deepening poverty, loss of food security, and the further collapse of the rural sector in developing countries, resulting in more mass, vulnerable, labor migration. A NAMA deal will deeply liberalize fishery, manufacturing, and most other economic sectors not covered by AoA and GATS. More factory closures, unemployment and de-industrialization, especially in the developing countries, are expected.

An agreement on GATS will further force open the labor markets and virtually all service sectors (public services, water, power, etc.) of developing economies. This will intensify privatization of essential public/social services, and undermine the capacity and responsibility of the government to provide such services. Profit, not service, will be the bottom line. Also, developed countries are pushing for “benchmarks” (minimum levels of liberalization in services), thus undermining the “positive list” principle agreed in the past (i.e. countries are free to designate which sectors they want to liberalize). Governments could not withdraw or reduce their GATS commitments, else they can be challenged under WTO rules, sanctioned or required to pay compensation.

Mode 4 of the GATS, which deals in the “temporary cross-border movement of natural persons” (essentially movement of professional employees/personnel of transnational corporations) has been extremely controversial due to its potential impact on labor markets and migration flows without concomitant human and labor rights protections. “The competencies and structure of the WTO do not enable it to regulate migratory movements, including those stipulated in Mode 4, in a manner that protects migrant workers’ rights.”

Although current commitments under GATS cover only skilled professionals, GATS itself does not define the skill level of service providers, and thus could be expanded through the negotiation rounds. GATS, including
Mode 4, promotes the labor flexibility and economic profitability needs of corporations and developed countries, not provide more work opportunities for the millions of unemployed migrants or enhance their rights, mobility and opportunities.

Therefore, migrants and people’s advocates assert that “no deal is better than a bad deal” in Hong Kong, and are campaigning to derail the WTO 6th Ministerial with the hope that three collapsed Ministerials will ultimately stop the WTO in its tracks.

**Migrants’ actions on WTO and neoliberalism**

As in the 3rd and 5th Ministerials, migrant advocates, together with the various social movements, will actively challenge the neo-liberal paradigm and WTO, the July framework, and the key agreements (GATS, AoA, NAMA). Civil society and social movements will challenge the non-democratic and non-transparent processes of the WTO.

In order to build the convergence of analysis, positions and action plans of the migrant, trade, debt, development and other social movements, AMC, MFA and partners co-organized the “Regional Conference on WTO, Development & Migration: Building Migrant and People’s Solidarity in Challenging Neoliberal Development & WTO”, on 15-17 July 2005 in Hong Kong. This served as a venue for discussion and planning by migrants’ and various social movements about neo-liberalism, WTO, and alternative development. The meeting attempted to come up with a common, more coherent and sharper position on WTO, trade, migration and development, especially in the lead up...
The Hong Kong Declaration on WTO, Development and Migration (July 2005)

We, 70 participants from 16 Asian countries, representing migrant, trade, development, labour, women’s and social action groups and networks, came together for the ‘Regional Conference on WTO, Development and Migration: Building Migrant and People’s Solidarity in Challenging Neoliberal Development and WTO’ on 17-19 July 2005 in Hong Kong. This conference – jointly organised by the Migrant Forum in Asia (MFA), Coalition for Migrants’ Rights (CMR), Focus on the Global South, Jubilee South / Asia-Pacific Movement on Debt and Development (APMDD) and the Asian Migrant Centre (AMC) – brings together key migration, trade and development movements to converge our efforts on the World Trade Organisation (WTO) and the 6th Ministerial Conference in December 2005 in Hong Kong.

We have fought for decades for migrants’ rights, and struggled against anti-people development agendas and processes, including onerous foreign debt, structural adjustment programmes, and neoliberal globalisation.

This conference builds upon previous anti-globalisation initiatives around the region, such as the Colombo Meeting (2005), Asian Social Movement assemblies (2002, 2003, 2004), people’s forums against APEC/ASEM (yearly since 1995) and other regional meetings on trade and debt.

Joint Declaration

We declare that derailment is our strategy, and are working towards that objective at the 6th Ministerial Conference (MC6) in Hong Kong.

We uphold the positions of the Colombo Declaration on the current status of the WTO, the July Framework Agreement[1] and the undemocratic negotiation processes in the WTO. We uphold the declarations[2] of the Migrant Forum in Asia and advocates in rejecting the neoliberal agenda, as embodied by the IMF/WB, WTO, APEC and ASEM, as anti-migrant and anti-people. We reiterate our commitment to “imagine and construct an alternative world based on the fundamental principles respecting human rights and human dignity.”[3]

As the WTO’s crisis of legitimacy deepens in its 10th year, we mobilize to exacerbate its internal contradictions, and expose its inherent nature as undemocratic, corporate-driven, anti-poor, anti-women, anti-development and illegitimate.

We recall with pride the historic success achieved by the people’s movements at Seattle and Cancun in derailing the Ministerial meetings of the WTO in 1999 and 2003 respectively.

Crucial meetings of the WTO General Council will be held in July and October 2005. There is a real danger that negotiators will use these meetings to force a backdoor deal before the Hong Kong MC6, as they did in July 2004 in Geneva. We will work with the Geneva People’s Alliance to counter this.

Based on a rights, needs and gender framework, we assert that the WTO is inherently contradictory to human rights and democratic principles, as entrenched in unfair agreements such as the GATS and AoA.

We reject the WTO’s services agreement (GATS) that institutionalises the commodification of people.

Current negotiations in the WTO are leading developing countries towards false choices. In the GATS Mode 4 negotiations, developing countries trade-off policy space in agriculture and industry to gain access to labour. We reject this framework that treats workers, women and migrants as tradeable commodities.

We reject the AoA framework that has caused the widespread collapse of rural economies, displacing communities and increasing forced internal and external migration.

The WTO, International Monetary Fund (IMF), World Bank (WB), Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC), Asia-Europe Meeting (ASEM), Free Trade Agreements (FTAs) and Regional Trade Agreements (RTAs) are all complementary in pushing the neoliberal agenda of the trading powers and corporations. Our campaign therefore must be comprehensive in opposing all of these.

We shall strengthen and expand our solidarity with movements fighting against the WTO and neoliberal agendas. We shall work with peasants, fisherfolks, labor, women and other sectors to build common platforms for action and alternatives.

Calls

- Stop the neoliberal agenda of WTO, IMF and WB.
- Derail the WTO.
- No deal in WTO; No deal is better than a bad deal.
- Stop the corporate and exploitative agenda of WTO.
- Kong yee sai mau (Protest the WTO).
- People before Profits
- Services out of WTO, WTO out of services
- GATS out of WTO
- Migrants are not for sale
- Stop the commodification of women and workers

Joint Actions/strategies

Immediate

- Mobilize protests at the WTO General Council meeting in Geneva (July 25-30, October 19-20, 2005); send protest messages from around the world;
- Send solidarity message to Geneva Peoples Alliance meeting in their protest against WTO
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- Join and support the November 2005 campaign by Korean movements against APEC, poverty and war;
- Support the Korean People Solidarity campaign to push the Korean government for a referendum to get GATS out of WTO; support the signature campaign;
- Initiate and support national campaigns against WTO; hold dialogues with concerned national agencies;
- Support the Colombo Declaration’s proposal to mobilise on Dec. 14 as International Day of Protest Against GATS and WTO;
- Join and support the Asian regional “Migrants month” campaign of MFA (November 25 to December 18);
- Join and support the HKPA centralised mobilizations against WTO (December action week: December 11, 13, 18);
- Conduct simultaneous global actions against the WTO in December
- Hold a major migrant and people’s actions across Asia on December 18 to mark International Migrants’ Day; launch a big migrants’ action on December 18 in HK and link up with the HKPA anti-WTO action.
- Support the Women’s March against poverty and globalization; coordinate with migrants organizations;
- Support the regional meeting on trade (October last week, Bangkok); Support the Peasants March led by Via Campesina on December 16, Hong Kong.

### Strategy beyond 2005

We recognise that ours is an ongoing struggle that will build momentum as it links with, and contributes to, other processes initiated and taken up by Asian social movements.

We will undertake further studies to look at the complex linkages between remittances and development, as well as GATS and migration.

We will continue to build sub-regional formations and networks to expose the WTO through mass education, capacity building, national level demonstrations, and media campaigns.

Finally we will continue to pressure our governments to uphold people’s rights and national interest and refrain from furthering the WTO agenda.

### Conference Participants:

- Migrant Forum in Asia (MFA)
- Asian Migrant Centre (AMC)
- Coalition for Migrants Rights (CMR)
- Focus on the Global South
- Jubilee South – Asia Pacific Movement on Debt and Development (JS – APMDD)
- Ain O Salish Kendra (ASK)
- Welfare Association for Repatriated Bangladeshi Employees (WARBE)
- Refugee and Migratory Movements Research Unit (RMMRU)
- Centre for Education and Communication (CEC)
- Migrant Forum India
- Migrants - Mahabubnagar District Palamoori Contract Labor Union (Union)
- Women Rehabilitation Centre (WOREC)
- All Nepal Women’s Association (ANWA)
- Action Network for Migrants (ACTFORM)
- Center for Indonesian Migrant Workers (CIMW)
- Indonesian Migrant Workers Union (SBMI)
- Solidaritas Perempuan
- KOPBUMI
- Migrant Care
- Jarnas Pekabumi
- Center for Migrants Advocacy (CMA)
- Kanlungan Center Foundation, Inc.
- Kapisanan ng Kamag-anakan ng mga Manggagawang Migranteng Pilipino (KAKAMMPI)
- Unlad Kabayan Migrants Services Foundation, Inc.
- St. Francis Workers Centre
- Hope Workers Centre
- Joint Committee for Migrant Workers in Korea (JCMK)
- Indonesian Migrant Workers Union (IMWU)
- Alliance of Progressive Labour (APL)
- Asian Domestic Workers Union (ADWU)
- Filipino Domestic Helpers General Union (FDHGU)
- Friedrich Ebert Stiftung (FES)
- Woman Health Philippines
- Coalition Against Trafficking in Women – Asia Pacific (CATW-AP)
- Mekong Migration Network (MMN)
- Stop the New Rounds
- Freedom from Debt Coalition
- Ta’amneh Law Firm
- Charles Hector and Co.
- Far East Overseas Nepalese Association (FEONA)
- Asia Pacific Alliance of YMCA’s
- Hong Kong People’s Alliance (HKPA)
- Hong Kong Confederation of Trade Unions (HKCTU)
- International Gender and Trade Network (IGTN)
- Globalisation Monitor
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[1] After the collapse of the 2003 Cancun Ministerial, the WTO was put back on track at the July 2004 General Council Meeting in Geneva. The resultant July Framework launched far-reaching talks on agriculture, industrial tariffs, fisheries and services.


to the WTO MC6.

Endnotes

1 There are other major reasons for labor out-migration, including non-economic factors like social/political problems in the country of origin (e.g. estimated 1 million Burmese migrants and refugees in Thailand); see Patrick Taran, “Seven Causes of Migration in the Age of Globalization”, Asian Migrant Yearbook 2000, p. 14.


3 Under the MDG, developed countries have committed to allocate 0.7% of their GDP to overseas development aid (ODA) or FDI to less developed countries. However, this commitment has not been significantly fulfilled.

4 The Philippines and Indonesia now allow their migrant workers overseas to vote in national elections.