

**Presentation to the Select Committee on Wood Supply
and concerning the Recommendations of the Jaakko Pöyry Report**

by Ronald Fournier, B.A., B.Ed.

(Educated peasant & evolving eclectic)

on behalf of

**The Ford Alward Naturalist Association
The Atlantic Association of Professional Naturotherapists
and Negentropy Farms**

To the members of this panel and to the citizens of this province to whom those so-called "Crown Lands" belong,

I would normally have made this presentation in French; it is after all my native tongue, but as an Acadian leader once pointed out back in the seventies, Fredericton sometimes only understands 2 languages, English and violence. Not wanting to promote the latter, I've decided to use the former because there are presentations that should not only be read, but should be heard as well.

The people whom I represent know that, even though I presently live in the County of McCain, in the Province of Irving, I grew up here in the hills back of St-Basile on a farm and in the woods. After graduating in St-Basile, I did a first Bachelor in Sociology up here on the hill at the Collège St-Louis. However, unlike most of the shareholders, CEOs and bean counters that own and run the big companies that exploit our forests, I've been to the woods time and time again through my youth with brothers and my father, a man that not only knows the woods but could also show us the merits of a selective cut and thereby ensure a continuous supply of wood for our needs, whether it was firewood, some logs for the local sawmill, or a few cords of pulp wood. To this day, that is how I aim to manage my small woodlot so that my child can still have a real mixed stand when her time comes to inherit it.

You may have noticed that I did not refer to those companies as "forest companies". Occasionally, I give presentations to groups on the subject of ecological agriculture; I have a colleague in PEI that was telling me about a local potato grower who has become so severely sensitized to the chemicals he applies to his fields that he can't even stand boiling his own potatoes for lunch. So what he does now is to sell to another country all the potatoes he grows on his 200 acre farm, and then he goes down the road a few miles to buy organically grown potatoes for himself and his family. Any person who believes that clearcutting large sections of forests is the way to manage it "is no more a forester than that guy in PEI is a farmer". All they are interested in is large scale production of a commodity, regardless of the cost to others and to coming generation. In so doing, they have become "disconnected" from the very resource they exploit.

Some of those companies may call themselves "tree growing" companies but they are just as much "forest killing" companies!

The people I represent here today also feel, as I feel, that the time has come for all of us New Brunswickers to find out if we truly are the owners and managers of our own commons, or if, in fact, the

future of our commons will be decided upon by the influence of a Finnish whore like the consulting firm of Jaakko Pöyry!

After listening, reading and researching the matter, we are left to conclude that Jaakko Pöyry is interested solely in supporting the wishes of the Forest Products Association – the very folks who paid the bulk of the report's ½ million dollar cost. We don't want our government to go in the direction Jaakko Pöyry wants to send us, which is the path to intensive softwood fibre production over the majority of the public forest. Even though other fibers grown on farmland have been shown to be of a higher grade, pulp and paper will likely remain a part of our forest industry for at least a few years to come, but it would be foolish for us to completely tie ourselves to the fate of that one industry.

For several of my friends and colleagues, what Jaakko Pöyry proposes would represent an eventual "Deportation of the Acadian Forest"! Is that clear?!

Canada has signed several protocols, including "Kyoto" and "Biodiversity" but it would seem that the same politicians who sign these treaties and protocols only pay them lip service. What most people either forget or want to forget is that a healthy mixed forest, such as we have here, provides not only a source of wood for building, for firewood and for pulp, but what will increasingly become obvious over the next few years, is the fact that they fulfill one of our most precious needs: oxygen for the air we breathe. Presently, phytoplankton in the seas is contributing around 60 % of the oxygen we need. But practically every human activity ends up some way or other, sooner or later, in polluting our oceans. For those us who take the time to listen and watch, we can see that the oceans are bombarded constantly by the fallout of countless human activities, products and practices. How long do you think our oceanic phytoplankton can keep up its oxygen release when tankers go by and clean out their holds and ballasts, leaving a long trail of death behind them. As the phytoplankton declines, only a very health land-based ecosystem can take up the slack. This is where a mixed forest or predominantly deciduous forest can help; the same goes for sustainable agricultural practices.

Dear fellow citizens, you must educate yourself and come to understand the important processes that take place in a healthy forest: carbon sequestration, oxygen production, water retention and filtration, etc. All these services are even more important to us all than the other short-term resources that a forest can provide. We can still harvest some trees and sustain forests but, increasingly, we can expect that as the human population continues to grow and as our toxic emissions increase, the very system that sustains our life will gradually start to fail. As these stresses increase, it will gradually dawn on people that clearcutting, monoculture plantations and such foolishness are the land equivalent of destroying the phytoplankton's breeding ground.

We need to maintain what we have going for us now: a mix of hardwood and softwood tree species that can be made into valuable products, and a landscape capable of attracting visitors from near and far. Presently, the New Brunswick forest industry produces the fewest jobs per unit of wood harvested in Canada, and this decline in jobs per wood harvested has been on-going for decades. Our Department of Natural Resources and Energy continues to lose money on our public forest: it pays out more in maintaining and managing the public forest than the revenues received from the so-called "forest industry" that uses this land.

In 1975, I was part of a film crew that did a documentary film on the forest industry in the Madawaska County area. We did an interview in Fredericton with Mr. Tweedale who had done extensive research into forest management practices with a view to make recommendations about the future of Crown lands in NB. Back then, he was already recommending that public lands should better benefit the people of the province. Think for instance of Alaska where the people in some communities get a royalty check directly each year as compensation for the extraction of local resources. The relationship between the local citizens there and the resource extracting companies becomes very important and has to be based on trust and public input.

In this province, we are told that "New Brunswick has been internationally recognized for its forest harvesting and management practices. Our responsible environmental stewardship includes water protection, wildlife habitat preservation and biodiversity." This statement seems to be just another twenty year old propaganda myth created and sponsored by the industry itself.

However, if it was SO HOT and did so well, how come they say we are in such a mess today?

We did a bit research on the net and found some interesting things that others had posted about this Finnish whose consulting firm whose "services" we partially paid for, but whose business is to "please" only the industry.

Companies like Jaakko Pöyry produce no wood or paper themselves and are seldom to be found wielding a bulldozer or chainsaw. Their business is merely to help other firms promote, investigate, plan, design and set up pulp and paper mills and logging and plantation operations. Yet these consultancies exercise global clout out of all proportion to their size and numbers. With comfortable links to universities, aid agencies, machinery and paper firms, and government bureaucracies, they have helped blaze trails through the forest world from Tasmania to the arctic tundra.

Trying to understand where Nordic-based Jaakko Poyry Oy comes from, we found that it is the largest forestry and engineering consulting company in the world, with an estimated 40 per cent of the forest industry consultancy market worldwide and a turnover of more than US\$300 million in 1994 alone. Poyry, which absorbed the large Swedish consulting firm Interforest, has over 60 offices in 25 countries around the world - 11 in Brazil alone - and thousands of employees, and has been involved in hundreds of major commercial forestry and pulp and paper projects in the last two decades across the Americas, Africa, Asia, Oceania and Europe.

Poyry's work acts as a growth hormone for industrial forestry. We have included several paragraphs later in this presentation containing more information about this "lovejoy" of multinational companies. Even if we don't have time to cover it all, I strongly recommend to this committee that you take the time to read this. Apparently more can be found on the Internet.

Sadly, we see that what's happening here is only part of the longer-term agenda of multinational companies. The BC government recently passed Bill 46, the Land Amendments Act. The bill is the enabling legislation allowing the provincial Cabinet to issue order in council to implement its "Working Forest Initiative", which spans 45 million hectares of BC's public (Crown) forest lands - all public forest lands outside of parks. While the Campbell government vehemently denies it, the Working Forest Initiative is a move to facilitate the privatization of BC's public forest lands. In fact, Minister of Sustainable Resource Management Stan Hagen stated in the Legislature when discussing the issue of providing certainty for private interests, "We're offering certainty through the strategic sale of Crown land, which will be a catalyst for economic partnerships."

As we know, the privatization of public assets happens in steps, piece by piece, incrementally over time. While the government is denying that their Working Forest Initiative is privatization, the people in BC are starting to recognize the step by step removal of the legislative and procedural frameworks that were designed to keep public lands in public hands.

Along with facilitating the sale of Crown lands, the Working Forest Initiative will increase the compensatable rights of private logging companies by zoning Crown forests as Timber Access Targets and "special land-use zones" with "unique administrative provisions to minimize potential shifts to other uses" (page 8). As a consequence, this will result in enhanced compensation packages to private forestry companies, to be paid by the BC taxpayer, when First Nations treaties are settled or new parks are created. Why? An analogy that can be drawn is when a single-housing residential neighbourhood is rezoned for high-rise developments: generally,

the value of the properties will go up at the time of their sale. Similarly, if tenured logging companies are denied access to the public timber supply due to First Nations treaty settlement, compensation prices to affected companies will increase if the Crown lands are covered by the Working Forest's timber zones. However, it would be the BC taxpayer who would bear the burden of this increased pay-out to private companies.

I believe the push is also in Newfoundland - pressure to increase yield...And, like the story of water privatization, it is done in nice little steps, first one thing then another, then the whole lot. Same story with electricity.

You might be interested to know that Jaako Pöyry completed a report on value-added manufacturing for Ontario that advises the province to move away from low value, high volume commodity manufacturing to value added etc. Entitled "Assessment of the Status and Future Opportunities of Ontario's Solid Wood Value-Added Sector". Has the NB government not seen it? You can download it from www.livinglegacytrust.org

We cannot agree that timber guarantees would be established for the companies and a silviculture trust fund would be set up with public and private money to fund the transformation of Crown lands to plantations.

The big companies propose a system to formally insert themselves into the development and implementation of public policy.

This is also accomplished in a new dispute resolution process which relegates DNR and government to the same status as the Licensees where they each would refer disputes to a dispute resolution facilitator. For minor issues an impartial adjudicator with a forestry background would be used. For major issues, an administrative tribunal would be used. The tribunal would consist of an industry representative, a non-industry representative and a "neutral" chairperson. Decisions would be binding.

Even some of the government's own forestry experts are critical of the Jaakko Pöyry report. But there is a growing feeling amongst the population that our own New Brunswick trained people with extensive experience are more less muzzled, while industry gets to come time and time again to make presentations about a report that they themselves commissioned; it therefore turns this whole process into a classic farce. It would be funny, were it not for the devastating impact this might have unless the people of this province wake up.

We suspect that this is case like that of the insurance companies wanting to dig too deep in our pockets. The ruling party practically lost the election over it and now the insurance industry is fighting to retain control. Perhaps the so-called "forest industry" has gone too far and hired a whore that's a little too obvious. This whole thing may serve to shake the population awake.

"A clearcut plantation makes a regular clearcut look good." This was comment heard recently from someone having seen a 30 year-old stand of jack pine mowed down in the Fundy area.

It was interesting to watch the industry running around like chickens with their heads cut off a few years ago when the Supreme Court of Canada recognized the treaty right for Natives to cut wood on Crown lands. "My God", they were saying, "look at what some of them are doing, going right in there with big machinery. They might start clearcutting left and right just to make a quick buck and without proper management practices."

For centuries, the white man has complained that Natives should learn from him how to work, earn a decent wage, and so on. I wonder where and from whom those Natives might have learned to go to the woods with heavy machinery and do some clearcutting. In fact, various academics have contrasted the

Indigenous world view with the Western approaches: one economy is based upon steady-state and the other upon steady growth; one trades in concrete values of goods and services and the other in abstract forms of currency; one culture is based upon the dispersion of wealth and the other upon accumulation. Whereas aboriginal societies were governed through custom and protocol, taught through social pressure, the visitors followed sets of written and codified laws with truth pursued through an adversarial process of trials and evidence –

Many decades ago, the Irvings were able to get thousands of acres of woodland that the province had set aside for the now defunct New Brunswick Railway Company for just a few dollars an acre. The right political connections did it and probably some well injected social lubricant (money). In 1979, I was part of another team doing a documentary film on the history of Madawaska County. In the course of interviewing some elderly gentlemen who had been associated with the importation of contraband alcohol during prohibition, 2 of them alluded to being hired to help unload an Irving ship that was rum-running between NB and the islands of St-Pierre & Miquelon. Just as in the case of the Bronfman's, some of their so-called hard earned money helped them get set up and gain an advantage over their fellow Canadians. After reaping the profits from those large tracks of land, well, we now know that K.C. Irving didn't die a Canadian. He took off with 500 million dollars to settle in Nassau in order to avoid paying taxes on this. That is we are unable to believe anything the Irvings now tell us. Especially when it comes to job creation and the future of New Brunswick. Think of how many jobs we could have created with taxes on 500 million dollars!

So, instead of allowing outside interest gradually take over our own public lands, we would strongly recommend that we reclaim some of that so-called Irving freehold that they got for a song, and put it back in the hands of the Natives. Now that we see what the Irvings did with the money they extracted from those large tracks of forest, let's give the Natives a try. We are sure they would not do any worse, and we are fairly sure that those would fair much better; of course some of it would have to be allowed to regenerate into the original mixed stands they once had. Because the Natives are attached to the land, like many of us peasants, they are not likely to run to Nassau!

We heard from a man working for one of the licensees that he got a note along with his paycheck encouraging him to tell his MLA that he supported JP report. And we thought feudalism was over a long time ago!

There are about 70 sub-licensees left of the 150 when the system was introduced. And the good news is that every time a sublicensees goes under, the licensee which "organized" the supply of logs for the sub., "inherits" the sublicensees wood allocation! We should not be surprised the subs stand up for anything the licensees propose. They are so dependant that they have no choice. The survival of their mills depends on the quality of the logs or chances made available from Crown forests by the LICENSEES. Also if they cannot survive, about the only outfits in position to buy them are licensees. Only licensees and sublicensees are members of the NBFPA.

So, that is why we demand a real democratic debate on the future of crown lands before making radical changes, NOT a review of the industry agenda! The government has no mandate to radically change legislation on crown lands. We see the future in low impact forestry, which yields more long term jobs and higher potential for value added, and initiatives for community forestry - give the little guy a chance!

We are against an industry controlled economy and, in this case, the conversion of 40% of Crown lands into monoculture pulp plantations. We oppose binding targets for wood supply, especially doubled targets, that make tax payers financially liable to corporations, and are also against increased logging of special management zones and protected areas.

We are seriously concerned about the industry's long term goal of outsourcing the monitoring of Crown lands to private auditors and streamlining government personnel.

We are concerned by some of the incestuous relations between members of the present government and the Irvings. While this may be known by most of the panel members, the public at large may not know that the guy who manages all the media for the Irvings is the brother of the present Finance Minister and former Minister of Natural Resources and Energy. And that they have a close relative in upper management at Fraser's while the direction of the local weekly Le Madawaska was given to another close relative after the Irvings bought yet another newspaper. "All in the family" seems to be the theme with this company.

(End of verbal part of presentation with a second invitation to Committee members to read the rest of the info on Jaakko Poyry Oy)

Finally, a bit more information about JP. Wherever possibilities for commercial exploitation beckon, the firm's consultants are likely to be on the scene early, lobbying governments, evaluating forest and land resources, lining up contracts from close colleagues in aid agencies, subcontracting lucrative work out to potential local allies, doing feasibility studies or market surveys, mapping out logging roads, establishing tree nurseries, and designing or engineering factories. Relying on contracts both from state and international agencies and from the private sector, Poyry has served as a crucial go-between linking the interests of international and national business and officialdom and bringing together machinery and techniques with land and forests.

A 1984 contract with the World Bank and the Indonesian government to analyze the country's paper and pulp possibilities helped Poyry land over 30 subsequent contracts to plan or implement public and private sector projects to supply mills with pulpwood from natural forests or plantations. In addition, the company has picked up scores of contracts -- some of them subsidized by Finnish taxpayers through Finnish Export Credit and FINNIDA -- to plan or engineer pulp or paper mills for Indonesian clients or do market surveys for Western machinery manufacturers

A subsidized company

Poyry has built its power and prosperity partly on handouts from governments. Finland's FINNIDA and Sweden's SIDA have been particularly generous in channeling tax revenues to Poyry for plans and technical services for pulping, logging and plantations in the Third World. Among the countries affected by this largesse have been the Philippines, Thailand, Sri Lanka, Tanzania, Nepal, Zambia, Kenya, Viet Nam and Mozambique.

Other government subsidies for Poyry have been transferred through multilateral agencies such as the Asian Development Bank (ADB), African Development Bank, Inter-American Development Bank (IDB), the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development, and the World Bank. The sums involved can be large. The World Bank alone provided US\$1.416 billion in cheap finance for the establishment of 2.9 million hectares of mainly commercial tree plantations between 1984 and 1994. In addition to helping Poyry plan the buildup of Indonesia's pulp and paper industry (1984 and 1987-8, involving the World Bank and ADB), multilateral agencies have funded Poyry studies of investment opportunities in Latin America, Viet Nam and Nepal (1981-2, 1990-1, and 1986-present, involving IDB and ADB) and forestry development plans for Cameroon, Central African Republic, Congo, Ethiopia, Ghana, Nigeria, Sudan, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Laos, Nepal, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, the Philippines and Sri Lanka.

Valuable links

Helping Poyry scoop up its share of the thousands of consultancy contracts put out yearly by international borrowers are close personal and ideological links between its staff and various official bodies (5). These

links are forged through shared backgrounds, education and experience as well as through mutual attendance at meetings industrialized-country governments sponsor to bring their country's firms together with multilateral financiers. In 1994, for example, Poyry, which had no previous experience in India, was selected over 15 Indian bidders to carry out World Bank forestry projects in Kerala and Uttar Pradesh. The person in charge of Bank forestry programmes in India was a former vice-president of the Jaakko Poyry Group, Christian Keil. India's Inspector General of Forests, A. K. Mukerji, meanwhile, who had recently been a guest of Jaakko Poyry in Finland, was reportedly preparing to open a branch of the firm in India upon his retirement from the civil service.

In countries where such channels are lacking, Poyry has not been shy about intervening in national politics. In Thailand, the Poyry consultant leading the formulation of a contested Forestry Sector Master Plan openly admitted that his activities were aimed at bringing Thailand's "institutional and social frame into shape" in a way which would allow the wider application of Western techniques of industrial forestry.

Few official or professional sanctions exist in Poyry's home country of Finland which might be applied against such questionable practices. Although Poyry's Forest Policy explicitly commits the company to maintaining species biodiversity and to advocating that "any natural forest area which demonstrates untouched unique ecosystems be set aside for conservation even if it has been assigned for industrial forestry", the firm is involved in (for instance) several projects in Indonesia which are expressly designed to start up by feeding off mixed tropical hardwoods from native forests.

Public relations and espionage

In maintaining and defending its networks, Poyry is skilled at adjusting to the times. Official gatherings such as the 1992 Earth Summit in Rio de Janeiro provide rich opportunities for the firm to lobby for the diversion of public funds to itself in the guise of 'environmental aid'. In 1993, it began to publish a confidential quarterly report on environmentalist thinking and activities, aimed at a clientele of wealthy forestry companies, and based partly on information gathered by monitoring NGO publications, watching environmentalists' electronic mail conferences, and sending queries to environmental groups.

Poyry is also confident of its ability to deal with the Nordic media. When Poyry Chief Executive Officer Henrik Ehrnrooth and Poyry Consulting Division president Jouko Virta were publicly criticized in Finland about Poyry's involvement in a plantation project in the Dominican Republic, they simply denied that the firm had even been in that country, despite being shown Dominican newspaper clippings and photographs reporting Virta's negotiation of a Dominican plantation contract.

Poyry at work

Poyry's Thai Forestry Sector Master Plan (TFSMP) offers one interesting illustration of how the company attempts to work its way into a position of influence in a country's forestry practice.

In the mid-1980s, the firm had found it difficult to make inroads into the highly personalized world of Thai officialdom. But with the help of a Swiss-born local timber expert named Nat Inthakan, introductions were finally arranged between Poyry Consulting Division chief Jouko Virta and top businessmen, bureaucrats and politicians. Virta then sketched out terms of reference for a plan for developing Thai forestry. Approved by then Prime Minister Prem Tinsulanonda in 1988, the plan was funded by FINNIDA through the United Nations Development Programme, which promptly selected Poyry as plan consultant.

The Thai Forest Department, however, resisted working with Poyry from the start. In addition, some 205 NGOs involved in rural development objected that Poyry's plan would strengthen state and industrial control over forests at the expense of local communities and their commons.

To overcome these difficulties, Poyry began a major effort to lobby bureaucrats and mollify malcontents. Thai forestry faculty were hired as plan consultants, and two NGOs were persuaded to serve on the plan's steering committee; one soon afterwards received an unusual US\$20,000 grant from FINNIDA. In the voluminous newsletters and briefings put out by the master plan team, meanwhile, the TFSMP was presented as an infinitely self-correcting "rolling process" capable of accommodating any criticism from any actor, whether villager, bureaucrat, or businessperson.

NGOs, nevertheless, continued to object, pointing out that Poyry, in proposing repeal of the popular 1989 logging ban, was engaged in political subversion. Poyry's claim to support customary land rights and local control, NGOs added, was at odds with the company's recommendation to "accelerate out-migration from the forest lands" and its acquiescence in official top-down management schemes.

Frustrated with such criticisms, the Poyry team stopped presenting itself merely as a "technical" appendage supplying facts to policymakers. Instead, it began advertising itself as a political facilitator of a compromise "national vision" of Thai forests. Poyry's adoption of this openly political role only provoked further sarcasm. As one NGO leader noted in 1993, "'national values' as perceived by the master plan team bear little resemblance to the values local people place on collectively managing community forests". An emotional Jouko Virta countered that only two or three "anarchists" in Thailand were critical of Poyry's planning. Any problems with the plan, other Poyry staff claimed, were due to NGOs' refusal to participate.

In the end, the relative indifference of Thai officialdom was instrumental in stymieing Poyry's bigger ambitions of redrafting Thailand's forest policy and reforming its practice. The Thai cabinet never approved the completed TFSMP, nor did any state bureaucracies rally round its banner. Predictably, the plan wound up, in words which anthropologist James Ferguson has used to describe development projects in Lesotho, like a "bread crumb thrown into an ant's nest". It remained a component in a larger machine, treated largely as a "shopping list" from which various bureaucracies and companies within Thailand could choose isolated items which could benefit their own circles. As one important side effect, however, the plan did help build new and no doubt enduring links between Poyry and the country's pulp and paper interests.

World Rainforest Movement Bulletin Jaakko Poyry: more than mere consultants

Jaakko Poyry is one of the actors involved in creating the conditions for establishing plantations. This consulting company was born in Finland 40 years ago. It grew up together with the boom of Scandinavian forestry after the war, when Finland, Sweden and Norway became one of the superpowers of industrial forestry. Jaakko Poyry was there, helping them to do it. Its role was to provide special expertise about planning pulp mills, paper mills, plantations, logging, how to plan industrial operations. At first its clients were Sweden, Finland, Norway and the rest of Europe. In the last couple of decades it started to expand globally and this has followed the pressures to expand plantations to the South, the pressures to exploit the forests of the South. This is a result of that but it is also one of the things that has facilitated this move to the South. Because as a consultancy, Jaakko Poyry plays an important role to get the land together with the machines, to get the officials together with the executives, to get the consultants together with the Forestry Department, so that the land can be converted to something which will support industrial forestry for pulp and paper.

Its role in the South especially --although obviously in the North as well-- is essentially political. They advertise themselves as technicians, but their role is largely networking, getting people together, getting the industry together with the officials, selling pulp and paper machinery,

selling forestry machinery from Scandinavia and other countries, getting together the technology with the political infrastructure in each country. That's basically what they do. They have offices in 25 countries around the world and employ almost 5,000 people.

Indonesia provides a clear example of Jaakko Poyry's work. First hired by the World Bank to do surveys, assessments and planning for the entire forestry sector in Indonesia, this later resulted in contracts to help the specific private firms who were involved in plantations and industrial forestry in Indonesia, where many pulp mills are now being built.

In 1988 Jaakko Poyry did a study of Indonesia's timber resources for the Asia Development Bank and this was to identify sites for the development of the pulp industry in that country. As a result of that there are now 65 big pulp mills planned for Indonesia, with another 15 with permission to operate. Since then, the Finnish government agencies have provided guarantees, bank loans, technical advisors and equipment for the pulp and paper development in Indonesia and this includes setting up the plantations and then setting up the pulp factories which work from that. A number of other Finnish agencies and companies benefited later from this.

Jaakko Poyry did the feasibility study for Indorayon in the North of Sumatra, and advised and supervised the plantations, the nursery and the equipment that went into that. It was also involved in Indah Kiat, which is another huge development in Riau, including pulp mills and paper production and in the Riau Andalan plant as well, where UPM/Kymmene (from Finland) is now involved. The PT TEL pulp mill also included Jaakko Poyry involvement, as well as the Finantara Intiga project in West Kalimantan, which is a joint venture between ENSO (The Finnish forestry state agency) and the Indonesian cigarette company Gutam Garang, who established a large plantation and there's a factory due for construction there in East Kalimantan.

Those are just some examples within the whole pulp industry and the plantations on which they depend, that are a result of Jaakko Poyry's work. These pulp mills are at the moment using native forests because the plantations are not yet mature. In the case of Indorayon the plantations are mature now, but to create those plantations they destroyed the forest. The only example where mills have not been built first and then the plantations set up is the case of Finantara Intiga, where they have set up the plantations before they even built the mill. But the general pattern is the other way round: they build the mill, they get a timber concession, clear-fell and then establish the plantation.

In spite of all the above -which are only some examples in one single country- Jaakko Poyry is now trying to promote itself as a "green" consultancy. However, its activities are being challenged, not only by the people directly affected, but also by Finnish NGOs, who have organized a number of seminars to show this to the Finnish public, on whose support the company depends to a large extent.

Source: WRM's bulletin N° 13, July 1998