

ANNEX 3
TO MINUTES OF THE JAKARTA MEETING

STATEMENTS AT OPENING SESSION



**PRESIDENT
REPUBLIC OF INDONESIA**

Honourable Chairman and Vice-Chairmen;
Distinguished Members of the World Commission on
Environment and Development;
Ladies and Gentlemen;

On behalf of the Government and of myself, I would like to extend my warmest welcome to all Members of the World Commission on Environment and Development who are holding their meeting for the first time in a developing country, in our Homeland.

The current Meeting of the World Commission takes place in the midst of the Indonesian people who are embarking on the second year of the Fourth Five Year Development Plan starting on the 1st of April 1985. It also takes place amidst a world community still suffering from economic recession, hunger and poverty, as well as a growingly intense arms race. Such unfavourable world situation certainly cannot escape our attention when we discuss environment and development.



**ADDRESS
BY
THE PRESIDENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF INDONESIA
HIS EXCELLENCY SOEHARTO
AT THE OPENING OF THE MEETING OF
THE WORLD COMMISSION ON ENVIRONMENT
AND DEVELOPMENT**

Jakarta, 27 March 1985

STATE SECRETARIAT OF THE REPUBLIC OF INDONESIA

Ladies and Gentlemen;

It has already been sixteen years that the Indonesian nation carried out development, which we consider as a major struggle to free ourselves from the scourge of poverty and to create prosperity for the people. We are pleased that many progress has been achieved. Our nation succeeded in freeing itself from the grip of hunger and from the abyss of disunity threatening the nation's cohesion, which, quite often, disrupt the growth of many developing countries. But we are also well aware that there are still many things we have to accomplish. There is a great number of our people who still do not have job, education opportunity, health services and other adequate human needs.

In order to build a nation with a population of more than 160 million, such as the case with our Homeland, it requires hard work and untiring development endeavours for a long period of time.

It is precisely in carrying out this long-term development that we are aware of the important role of the environment. Long-term development necessitates natural and human resources which are managed uninterruptedly. For this reason, therefore, we must preserve the potential of natural resources to sustain a continuous development pattern.

Drawing the lesson from the development experience of other societies, we become well aware that the development in the fields of agriculture, industry, energy, human settlement and others create possible potentials to pollute the rivers, the sea, the air and the environment in general.

Recognising the important function of environment, the People's Deliberative Assembly, as the highest state organ vested with the sovereignty of the people, stipulates in its Guidelines of State Policy the need to carry out development with environment consideration. It is also emphasised that the goal of our long-term

development is to build a complete Indonesian Man and to build the whole of the Indonesian Society.

As far as the Indonesian nation is concerned, development is neither aimed merely at pursuing material progress such as clothes, housing projects and other physical things. Nor is it aimed only at fulfilling spiritual needs such as education, justice and other spiritual matters. Our development is aimed towards the harmony and the balance between both.

We are longing for the creation of a complete Indonesian Man whose character is endowed with the harmonious relationship between man and his God, between man and his society and between man and his natural environment.

Therefore, a harmonious environment is not only important in the way we develop our nation, but it is also significant as the objective of development itself.

It is not an easy endeavour to attain these aspirations, but we are determined and work hard to do our best.

Ladies and Gentlemen;

Due to technological advancement, nations become increasingly entwined closer to each other. But within this entwinement between nations, an unbalanced inter-dependent relationship is also formed between the advanced countries in the Northern hemisphere and the developing countries in the Southern hemisphere.

Meanwhile, the world population is growing from the present 4 billion to become eventually 6 billion in the year 2000. More than half of this population is in the Asia-Pacific region. At the current rate of population growth, all of us in the Asia-Pacific region is faced with a challenge to carry out development in order to remove poverty and to raise the prosperity of the people

through ways and means that are not detrimental to the environment and destroy the natural resources.

For this purpose we have to look far ahead. Collectively, we must prepare the Asia-Pacific community to have the ability to manage its environment and, simultaneously, to manage the population within the framework of a continuous development pattern.

If each country is responsible for the wise management of its natural resources within its respective national boundaries, joint efforts must therefore be made to manage common natural resources beyond their boundaries such as, for instance, the sea, the polar region, the air, the outerspace and the likes.

This requires a consensus in dealing with eco-development. Such consensus is also needed to preserve the existing eco-system diversity of our planet earth, which is the Homeland of the whole of mankind.

The more diversified the eco-system, the more stable will be the environment supportive strength to sustain the life of man. It is therefore necessary to establish cooperative relation amongst nations in order to preserve the eco-system diversity. In this connection, the establishment of sub-regional cooperation, which covers several countries and has a harmonious scope, must be encouraged, beside the already growing regional cooperation. Our experience with ASEAN shows that sub-regional cooperation can be more practical and effective.

The pattern of eco-system diversity also requires developmental approaches from below and motivations for the direct participation of the society in the development process.

It is in this context that the role of the social self-supporting organs becomes extremely important in making themselves effective as a means to involve the participation of as many members of the community as possible to promote eco-development.

If an eco-development is to be promoted within the context of cooperative relationship between countries, such cooperative institution must be based on a number of main principles.

First is the principle of equitable opportunity to manage the natural resources, which should be open to everybody, both the rich and the poor. The principle of equity must also be upheld to provide opportunity to all, both the advanced and the developing countries should obtain the information and technology on the methods to develop without creating destruction. Furthermore, the principle of equity must be promoted in upholding the responsibility to preserve a harmonious and balanced environment which sustains continuous development by all nations, for all nations.

Second is the principle of solidarity between the present and the future generations to provide guidance for the management of natural resources and prevent them from being completely depleted. This spirit of solidarity compels us to broaden the developmental horizon from the present to the future dimension, from the interest of one group to the interest of a collective group, and from the interest of one country to the interest of the whole of mankind.

This is the principle of participation by everybody in promoting the environment. The environmental problems are created by man and so it is necessary that he is actively involved in the environment and promotes himself from a destroyer to a promoter of environment. This also applies to society and nation. Thus, the problem of environment in the world must be tackled by the participation of all.

Our world is growingly becoming even smaller because of science and technology. But, at the same time, science and technology have also created man-made environmental problems.

In order to overcome them, an international cooperative order is needed which has a greater capability to answer the increasingly urgent environmental challenges.

Equity, solidarity and participation of the people can serve as the main principles to stimulate cooperation between countries in view of building a new world into which environment considerations are fully integrated.

It is with this spirit, hope and appeal that I warmly welcome the Meeting of the World Commission on Environment and Development, and may the World Commission succeed in paving the ground for an eco-development sustained by the cooperation between countries towards the creation of a just, prosperous, green and sustainable world.

In conclusion, I hereby declare the Meeting of the World Commission on Environment and Development officially opened.

May God Almighty bestow His blessings on all of us.

Thank you.



WORLD COMMISSION ON ENVIRONMENT AND DEVELOPMENT

Opening Address
by Mrs Gro Harlem Brundtland
Chairman
at the Second Meeting
of the World Commission on Environment
and Development
Jakarta, Indonesia
March 27-29, 1985

President Suharto, Your excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen

I wish to express my great pleasure at being here and to transmit the expression of that same pleasure on behalf of the Commissioners of the World Commission on Environment and Development and secretariat members. We have all been looking forward to spending the last week in March here in Indonesia.

We have already had most stimulating contributions at the Public Hearing yesterday from your very active non-governmental organizations, from your distinguished scholars and from the heads of your foremost scientific and technical institutes. Mr. Salim arranged to show the Commission in a concerted, well-organized style the scope and depth of environmental concern in Indonesia. We are very grateful.

Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen

When I was a student I read a lengthy and classic book which said among other things that ... "Taking it as a whole, and surveying it from every point of view, Java is probably the very finest and most interesting tropical island in the world."

That was some time ago. I did not envisage that some day I would find myself in the capital, speaking before the government and distinguished citizens, and thanking the President of Indonesia for his kind invitation. Nor could I imagine that my responsibility, when here, would be a reflection of some of the perspectives contained in that book.

You, the Indonesians, acknowledge the need to take full command of your inheritance. Like so many newly industrializing countries you are grappling with the problems of development against the backdrop of rising population, rural poverty, and recent world economic difficulties.

You, with your neighbour Malaysia, were badly affected as oil exporters by the fall in prices of your oil exports after 1981. The adjustment to the slower growth in world trade has been painful - but at least by cautious financial management you spared yourselves heavy indebtedness. You can look forward to continuing economic growth if all goes well.

Where, in the midst of such short term economic struggles, does environment come?

My first major political responsibility was to be environment minister. It was my task for five years in a country much smaller than this, and much colder! As Norway has a rapidly expanding oil economy our cabinet meetings were also often dominated by crises in the balance of payments, fluctuations in the currency because of what happened to oil prices in Rotterdam, the corrosive effects of inflation. In our interdependent world I am certain that government ministers would not find themselves lost in other countries cabinet and council meetings. In Norway it was our own citizens who helped to keep the mind of the government on the environment. The long term damage to our national environment and the need to fashion changes in our industrial practices were there for everyone to see who cared to open their eyes. We were reminded of the need for international cooperation by the continuing showers of acid rain sent to us by our upwind industrial neighbors.

It is characteristic of environment and development problems that they look as if they can wait until something more urgent is dealt with. Until, that is, a situation has become a crisis or clearly catastrophic. Then there is a scramble to find the cheapest solution and get into immediate action. Nobody then likes to admit that the cheapest solution was to heed the warnings 10 or 15 years before and prevent the situation.

It reminds me of a story often told about Winston Churchill in World War II. On one of his travels he was offered a small specimen of a rare, slow growing tree to plant in his garden back home in Britain. He asked when he could collect the tree and his host said "why not some time later this week, after all it takes a hundred years to grow." "That is why I must take it today," said Churchill, "if it takes so long, we must begin immediately."

That is what we might say of the environment and sustainable development "we must begin immediately."

But did we not begin in 1972 with the United Nations Environment Conference in Stockholm and the creation of UNEP? Do we not have machinery in most governments already functioning? Do we not have various multilateral organizations grappling with trans boundary air pollution, freshwater and marine pollution, potentially toxic chemicals, ozone, carbon dioxide, deforestation and a host of other matters? The answer is yes, of course, we do.

But is it all working? The answer is no, it is not.

Only in minor parts of the rich industrialized world has the quality of the environment improved over the last 15 years. There have been new legislation, policies and institutions but they have largely addressed the massive backlog of degradation and pollution that came from rapid economic growth in the fifties and sixties. Even so the battle against classic pollution is far from won: some of the measures like dispersing power station emissions with high chimneys have probably made things worse on a global basis because they have spread the emissions over a wider area, while reducing political support for truly effective control measures near the source. Many of the other problems like the pollution of ground water resources and loss of cropland to urban sprawl go on unabated or even accelerate.

On top of these continuing, one might almost say, traditional problems, new ones are looming out of the mists ahead of us. Some of them are at least easy to describe - the threat of climatic change arising from burning fossil fuel and the consequent rise in atmospheric carbon dioxide is a case in point.

If this phenomenon unfolds, as many scientists have predicted, the impact will be substantial. However, we already know some of the measures we can take to reduce it. We can accept the risk that the polar ice might start to melt with a resulting rise in sea level, and find ways of building dykes around our sea level cities like Bangkok, London, Jakarta, New York, Calcutta, Tokyo. The Dutch may have to raise their existing dykes by 10 metres at least. Alternatively we can try to find new sources of energy and stop burning oil and coal. Nuclear power, solar power, ocean thermal power and others are feasible but might well demand more capital than could ever be made available. Another choice, again prohibitively expensive and impracticable would be to scrub with sea water the carbon dioxide from fossil fuel exhaust emissions all over the world. Lastly, it might be possible to embody the carbon dioxide in the biomass of specially grown trees but these would have to cover 10 percent of the land area of the planet to be effective. Here then are some ways - although not very comforting ways - of addressing problems we can grasp.

But other types of problem are hardly described and classified yet. The interdependence of the modern world means that even apparently remote events can have an impact on the environment. Take an example from the sector of tariff and trade negotiations.

A decision in GATT to restrict the market for goods where developing countries have an advantage like cheap labour can cripple those countries' development and blight their foreign currency reserves. Following the chain of cause and effect we can see first a devaluation and then the local price of kerosene for the poor go up. Next the pressures on fuel wood resources increase and then, soil erosion increases and the base for sustainable development shrinks again. But do the negotiators in GATT struggling with many pressures, ever have time to give a thought to remote environmental consequences? Many of them may have no grasp whatever of the cluster of problems enmeshed in the two simple words environment and development.

We have examples of a deep malaise in our machinery for dealing with environmental problems even when we do anticipate them. Take desertification. The advance southwards of the Sahara has been logged by the scientific community for over twenty years. Warnings have gone to governments and institutions at the international level regularly and the great drought of the early seventies dramatized the human dimensions of the problems. In 1977 we had an international conference on desertification. A programme of action, or what we could rather call reaction, was designed and approved by governments.

But the response of the world community was so slight that the whole episode, to the despair of the UN Environment Programme, has become a case study in lack of political will.

And then the inevitable happened in the Sahel. The drought struck again. The non governmental aid groups in the field, UNICEF field workers, World Food Programme and FAO field workers all told their superiors and governments. But very little happened until television crews took home their harrowing film and, through the agency of public interest broadcasting, ignited popular indignation all over the world. Only then did the world community react. The reaction is too late for many thousands of children, mothers and old people.

The cost of combatting the present famine is not yet clear but the current emergency in Ethiopia alone will be not much less than \$400 million for the period from last autumn to the next rains. The value of the food accounts for \$208 million and the air forces of several great powers are deployed in the field making parachute drops of bulk food and subsequent local distribution by helicopter. You can imagine the true cost of such military operations with airborne maintenance teams, communications equipment and forward refuelling. And this is happening in areas so poor that a year ago it was almost impossible to get enough petrol to fill the tank of a passing Land Rover. And at the end of the day nothing in the way of combating desertification will have been achieved.

Suppose that donor governments had supported their own plans at the UN Conference on Desertification. What are the sums that the Plan of Action to control Desertification would have spent in Ethiopia? The UN Environment Programme has produced a figure - \$50 million.

Spending that money over the last 5 years would not necessarily have meant that there would have been *no* famine at all. Nothing is so simple. But it does tell us something - it does suggest that prevention is cheaper than cure. And in Ethiopia that \$400 million already spent this year is not a cure anyway! It is just a means to buy time, to survive and to postpone a very evil day.

For the eight countries of the Sahel not including Sudan and Ethiopia a four-year plan of desertification control has been proposed. It would combat soil erosion, stabilize sand dunes and reafforest to provide fuel wood. The cost would be \$108 million for four years - \$108 million in pursuit of sustainable development. Contrast that with the estimated food needs for the inhabitants for the same period which, unless starvation is permitted, will be \$1.390 million. And we know that the world community will not permit starvation when it is galvanized into action - or, more appropriately, reaction.

The absurdity of our behaviour as a world community is obvious. Lack of support for preventative measures results in almost as much money or more being spent to redress the human misery in an atmosphere of crisis and emotion.

Meanwhile the root causes remain. The land remains under stress from human activity. The stabilizing elements in an ecosystem - perennial vegetation, a stable water table, adequate stream flow and a fertile soil are under great pressure. When drought strikes the ecosystem gives way. It may even be that natural dry spells are intensified and prolonged by farming practices and the pattern of human activity. Desertification proceeds at exactly the same rate as it did in 1977 when the UN Conference on Desertification was held. It now threatens 35 per cent of the planet's land surface and 850 million poor people. We know the tragedy of Ethiopia will be repeated in other African countries and in other parts of the world.

Must we replay the same scenario for every environmental disaster? Must we wait until floods, droughts, and landslips break the hearts of poor people? Must we wait until we have accidents like Bhopal before we devise ways of anticipating and preventing environmental problems? Must we wait for the misery and death that the collapse of the environmental basis for civilized life inevitably brings?

In the world of aviation it is ironic that technical progress often comes from accidents and disasters. It is seldom admitted, but after many disasters it turns out that there were warning signs that, through indolence, incompetence, greed, hubris and arrogance, went unheeded, or they were lost in the noise from day to day operations. It sometimes seems that things which were known to be wrong are not fixed until deaths and lawsuits and recriminations explode in the face of society's institutions.

Are we going to fly spaceship earth like that? Because we, you and I, know lots of things are wrong and we do nothing about them?

And remember, in aviation after a crash they may say - "back to the drawing board". They can and do learn from mistakes. But we have only got one earth. We cannot go back to the drawing board and redesign it. We have to manage this single small planet for the benefit of us all. And we are not doing very well at the moment.

We must develop a new approach and pursue a novel perspective. We are convinced that we are not doomed to fly space-ship earth into disaster and oblivion. It is possible to harness science and technology in ways which are favourable to the environment. It is within our power and competence to increase food production enormously and to do it in ways which not only sustain but also expand the ecological basis for agriculture. Similarly, it is within our grasp to develop energy, industrial processes, transportation and human settlements which are consistent with sound environmental considerations. Fundamentally, we know that it is possible to build environmental considerations into development as a forethought rather than, as now, as an afterthought.

The limitations are not defined by the physical universe or our lack of understanding of what need to be done. They are determined rather by our inability to draw political conclusions, to make that possible which we know to be necessary. Vested interests, established jurisdictions, bureaucratic inertia and plain lack of vision and imagination are powerful obstacles and brakes. It is our task to remove them. But we cannot do it alone. We need support, and we need it now.

It is our task to re-examine the relationship between environment and development, to challenge the conventional wisdom and demonstrate the urgency of the issues and how the two are inextricably intertwined. Environmental consideration is not a luxury concern of those nations which have passed the take-off stage on the road to development. It is a necessary condition for sustainable development to become an attainable goal for any nation, rich and poor, northern or southern, eastern or western. Indeed some of the most dire threats against environment and development today are caused by widespread poverty and the inequitable distribution of resources and means within individual nations and among nations and regions on spaceship earth.

Our world is an interdependent world, but we know that it contains enormous inequities. Such inequities must be ameliorated if human beings everywhere are to be given the opportunity to enjoy their inalienable rights of "life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness" to quote from the American Declaration of Independence. We need a global declaration of independence which can liberate human beings everywhere. Such liberation requires solidarity and commitment on behalf of rich and poor alike, it requires a new international economic order which equitably serves the interests of all people.

The threat of war and destruction hangs over our planet like a dark cloud, affecting the lives and expectations of people everywhere. The prospect of nuclear destruction is the ultimate reminder of our need to work together to ensure a common future. The levels of armaments have reached obscene levels and the upward spirals point towards ever greater misallocations and dangers. The arms race must be stopped and reversed. A promising new beginning was made in Geneva earlier this month. Deep cuts in the arsenals of offensive weapons are necessary and possible to achieve without endangering anyone's security. Furthermore, care must be taken to protect the global commons; Antarctica, the deep seabed and outer space from being enveloped by the arms race. Hence, the nuclear weapon states must agree to prohibit the emplacement of weapons in space or to deploy weapons on the earth which threaten objects in space.

Warfare is the ultimate threat to our environment and joint survival. Hence there is a strong link between the work of the World Commission on Environment and Development and that of the Brandt Commission on development issues and the Palme Commission on international security issues.

The World Commission will assess and propose new forms of international cooperation which break out of existing patterns and promote the changes which are needed. Whilst doing this we shall attempt to raise the level of understanding and commitment everywhere. We must create the conditions for mobilizing political will to deal with the issues in an enlightened manner.

The members of the World Commission number 22 of whom 14 are from developing countries. They have been chosen for their eminence in environment, political and development affairs and although several are Ministers in office they serve in their personal capacity.

When we first met we asked ourselves whether we were likely to make substantial progress if we followed the conventional agenda.

What do we mean by the conventional agenda? Take some of the familiar issues like soil erosion, desertification, loss of cropland and wildlife habitat. They have all received attention as separate issues and have been studied at international, regional and national levels. They are all areas where, despite the expenditure of considerable effort, the situation is getting worse, not better.

We asked ourselves whether we were likely to make significant progress further along such well worn paths. Was there a new approach? Evidently all those environment problems have common sources in agriculture, land and settlement policies. Would it not be more useful to look at the root policies which lead to the intractable issues with which we have become so familiar?

Take other conventional agenda items: carbon dioxide and climate; air pollution: acid rain. They too are usually treated in isolation but they have their deeper roots in a common area, namely the energy policy nations have chosen. We saw that there was alternative, probably more fruitful way of looking at issues of environmental concern.

That is why we decided to adopt an "alternative agenda". We think that to focus attention on the common sources of environmental problems and on the related trade and economic policies is the only viable approach. Environmental concerns cannot be viewed as an add-on to other policies, but rather an integral element of all policies effecting the development of our societies. Such an approach will also enable the Commission to address a critically important audience - those key individuals and agencies which influence the primary economic and social policies and which thus in turn influence development, nationally and internationally.

We are striving to promote a change of mind set. We want to induce a move away from regarding environment as a political afterthought - something that the "productive" or big spending departments of government like agriculture, industry, energy, defence, the finance ministry itself, think about - if they think about it at all - after formulating key policies that not only exclude environmental considerations but often induce practices that destroy the environmental resource basis of the development being sought.

Using this alternative agenda the Commission will be in a much better position to command the attention of the key central and sectoral agencies in government. It can show that environment and development is the responsibility of bodies ranging from the central economic and financial institutions of government to their agriculture, energy, industry, trade, transport and other agencies whose policies and patterns of investment have a significant impact on the environment. Often those policies and investments are the cause of the critical problems.

Thus we shall show that anticipate-and-prevent strategies are the only realistic way of ensuring that the environmental dimension finds its true place at the centre of policy making.

All too often the environment minister finds himself called in to clean up problems created by his colleagues' own decisions earlier in the cycle of development. His is the melancholy duty of reacting after the event and fighting for money from a position of weakness, where the environmental afterthought is regarded, resentfully, as an extra un-anticipated cost.

The scenario, repeated all over the world in governments, rich and poor, has to be stopped. It can no longer be afforded. Third World governments in particular must respond to the lessons of recent history.

Third World countries are now industrializing, and building many of the highly polluting industries that brought prosperity to the North in the 1950s and 1960s. Many of the environment problems of the North are therefore now showing themselves in the Third World. London may still hold the record for the world's worst killer smog, a distinction achieved in 1952, but many cities in the Third World from Ankara to Mexico City regularly run it close. But you do not have to recapitulate those mistakes.

In the North industrial development, which was so careless of the environment, has imposed three separate charges on the people and the economy. The first comes from direct damage to the environment - with ruined rivers, poisonous waste dumps, destroyed landscape - and damage to the health of the population and the work force.

The next charge comes from the direct costs of curing all this, rehabilitating landscape, treating ground and river water, restoring habitat, meeting high medical costs. And many countries are now having a third set of charges - compensation for lives that have been blighted and property that has been damaged by pollution.

Unfortunately, several industrializing countries of the Third World are already well along the same road, building up the same problems. Acid rain, regarded as a scourge of Europe and North America, is already eating into the fabric of the Taj Mahal. That is the first cost, the next will be incurred. The only question is when.

In the future all of us, and especially you in the Third World, must grasp the lesson of recent history that the costs of protecting our resources and environment - which are the essential basis for future economic development - these costs must be paid, they must be taken out of production, but they need be paid only once. One charge, that of anticipating and preventing, is what you need to impose on your own industrialists and on those who have come from other countries to build their factories on your land. And when we do it that way, not only do we ensure that the basis for future growth is sustained and even expanded but also we find that the ultimate burden on our economy is much less.

The problem with prevention is that the costs come at the beginning. They are up-front and there are many insidious pressures on the governments to allow industry to avoid these costs and to lower, or fail to enforce, environmental standards. These pressures arise from the pursuit of things we all want - jobs and faster economic growth today, even at the expense of more sustained growth tomorrow. The pressures are particularly evident in primary industries such as minerals mining, forestry and the energy industries. We are all tempted in the short term to mortgage the environment. In developing countries the temptation is especially difficult to resist when international debt repayments are pressing and foreign exchange is lacking so that spare parts cannot be obtained.

But these pressures on our environment today are as nothing compared to what they will be by the year 2000 when a whole extra world of people and their demands will be imposed on the present one. When the world has 10 billion people what will be the pressures on the soil, water, energy sources, the genetic resources, the absorptive capacity of the environment, the atmosphere itself?

If you cannot defend a heritage like your tropical forests now what hope will you have of coping with the much greater pressure in 30 years time?

Your tropical forests are not only one of the wonders of the world studied by scientists but also are a national, indeed a world, resource beyond price. The industrial and business community has only recently begun to understand the meaning of genetic diversity as we move into new industries like biotechnology. The tropical forest is more than a place for getting timber from. It is a store, a reserve of great value for the new dawning industries of the next industrial revolution. What you have in Indonesia is a genetic Fort Knox, and you should guard it and maintain it accordingly.

You have tried hard to ensure that timber companies adjust their practices to leave species that will regenerate the forest after logging. I hope you are succeeding but there are few encouraging precedents either from the tropics or from temperate forests. Sadly, it often seems that making a living is for here and now but the environment and sustained development, they are always put off until tomorrow.

Your government, like so many others, lacks the means to enforce the measures needed to make development sustainable. Still, there is nothing unusual about governments finding it hard to have their way against pressures. Strong forces seek to change the minds of governments in the North as well. Witness the strong fight made by the North American and European automobile industry against emissions standards.

In the end governments have to turn for support to the people. Eventually, it has to be the people as a whole who create a climate in which a unique resource is cherished and exploited on a sustainable basis. The action of citizens themselves is the best defence of the environment. Such action comes from education and inspiration not just at the national but at the local level too. In this area the so-called non-governmental organizations have a crucial job to do.

One of the exciting things about the South East Asia is the growth of citizen action groups and organizations concerned with both environment and development. They are engaged in the defence of the environment when they feel it to be under attack. They are actively improving the environment in other areas. They are engaged in campaigning and educating the public and promoting environmental education among the young.

Mr President, I would add a personal observation. Yesterday I arrived in time to join the public hearings with many representatives of local, regional and national non-governmental organizations from throughout Indonesia. I was deeply impressed by their knowledge, their dedication, their achievements and their vitality. It is clear from that meeting that you have an even greater source of energy than oil, and that is the tremendous energy of the Indonesian people themselves. I and my colleagues on the Commission benefited a great deal from those public hearings yesterday with your experts from within and outside the government, and we want to express our special thanks and gratitude to you for providing us with that opportunity.

The Commission will be considering measures to improve the capacity of NGOs to exert their influence. We see often, for example, that when an NGO decides to fight to defend some part of the environment it comes up against a much stronger opponent. In appealing to public opinion through the media the NGO can find its way blocked by the big company that threatens to withdraw newspaper advertising if an editor favours the environmental cause. In the courts or at a public enquiry, the situation may be even worse. The rich company or the well connected parastatal organization can call on the best legal advice, and deploy research effort at will. But the NGO has to rely on voluntary effort and bake-sales to raise the money to fight.

Governments can change that if they want to. Enquiry procedures can be made more fair by the judiciary too. We are seeking advice on this and on other questions. For example, the practice of some governments to match dollar for dollar the funds raised by NGOs for development and environmental purposes. Is it a good thing? Should the practice be extended and consolidated among all governments, rich and poor?

There is much to be explored in the way of helping NGOs to pursue their objectives at various levels and in the various social and political contexts in which they work.

The Commission recognizes that the environment will be sustained only by the active involvement of all the people and there are many ways of encouraging this. But we need your help in our work.

I hope that the Commission's work will result in a strengthening of the capacity of people to take care of their own environment or where necessary improve it and rescue it from degradation. An essential element is that we learn to appreciate the inheritance of life on earth. Our communicators and educators must make one of their prime objectives the stimulation of this appreciation.

The particular natural inheritance which Indonesia enjoys is in fact very special. It was, as many of you will know, the contemplation of your fauna and flora that led to one of the greatest of human insights namely the theory of evolution. It was at Ternate in the Moluccas that the naturalist Alfred Russel Wallace over one hundred and twenty years ago seized the idea of the survival of the fittest. He had not only been collecting and studying your inheritance of living things, he had been reflecting on something else equally thought provoking in our own time, namely Malthus's "Essay on Population." Alfred Russel Wallace wrote to his friend Charles Darwin and their joint paper launched the theory of evolution.

Wallace left you a line on your maps that bears his name. It marks, between Bali and Lombok, the division between the Indian and Australian fauna and flora. It was he who wrote the lines about Java which I quoted as I began my speech.

I hope the Commission's work will lead to an increased cooperative effort by all of us on this earth in the care and maintenance of the biological basis for our own lives.