

and some available money for “strengthening civil society” such as through convening these forums and similar events.

- ☞ Policy changes are needed with respect to forest policy, at all levels, to recognize ecological values, and policy implementation changes are needed. A positive presentation of policy alternatives in a coherent strategy of which trade is an appropriate sub-part, along with other inter-connected areas of public policy, is the general direction articulated and agreed to by the group. Bringing forests decision-making closer to the community level, and strengthening the voice and opportunities for indigenous and aboriginal people to be directly involved in decisions about their forests, are two examples

4. Messages to APEC Leaders.

“NO” to the fast-tracking of forest products. YES to more open, democratic processes in negotiating economic agreements.

NO to the exclusion of social and environmental / livelihood and sustainability considerations from the global economic agreements. YES to more transparent cost and benefit analyses and explanations for forests, resources and values.

NO to the absence of democratic mechanisms, transparency, or representation of a legitimate cross-section of necessary perspectives, views and interests at the decision-making table on matters with repercussions and implications far beyond the narrow frame economics sets for itself. YES to involvement of a wider community in APEC.

NO to the continued narrowing of interests taken into account in relation to forest policy and benefiting from past and present policies and practices. Those who were enriched by taking the forest resource in inappropriate ways in the first place should not be able to reposition themselves to benefit from Government redirection of public resources, when the local communities and workers who depend on the forest base can be shown to continue to be the losers. This can be consistently shown to be the case from Sarawak to British Columbia – and NO to global markets structured so that two such diverse places as these two should be shown to have approximately the same stumpage rates. YES to full-cost accounting which also permits meaningful recognition of the non-quantifiable values associated with healthy forests.

NO to the idea that economic policy can be divorced or factored separately from environmental policy, and social policy. It can't. Economic policy that supports steady continued harvesting of the world's forests is unsustainable. Public policy that supports such a direction is not operating as a reasonable government should operate, and forest activist organizations see their role in part to be educating the public to increase accountability for delivery on better forest policies and management. YES to an integrated “sustainable livelihoods and planet” policy, with long-term resource and land use planning integrated with social and community development policy.