LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

Sir,

I enjoyed your review (Essay on the West Coast Beech Scheme, Vol. 18 (2)). However, while you have shown considerable ability at taking a rational approach on the “Beech scheme”, I would point out one thing. You state: “... in every case the principal consideration is to keep the resource undiminished, healthy and productive”, with the implication that it should be undiminished, healthy and productive from the point of view of the logging engineer. I have worked for an organization which reprimanded my superior for allowing dead trees to be pushed over in the forest. In the eyes of that organization which was managing (equals your no management) forest, a forest was only an undiminished, healthy and productive forest if trees were allowed to die and decay in situ!

One man’s management is another’s no management and another’s mismanagement!

H. A. Madgwick
Rotorua

Sir,

G. Rennison’s publication in Vol. 19 (1) of the Journal on forest recreation bears comment. I am rather concerned at the bit about the injuns — the ones that get back to the basics by parking their butts on the butte by way of absorbing a bit of soul-power that is. Now the trouble with this sort of thing is that it is liable to create impressions — particularly on young idealistic minds.

I’m not saying that it might not be on in Montana, but after 20 years of doing my thing as a forest manager in the sub-temperate rain forests of the local scene, I feel I should warn young readers that the fundamental thing I have gained from long indulgence in the recommended activity is — haemorrhoids!

G. V. Buckley
Hokitika