PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS: FORESTRY AND SOCIETY

P. J. McKelvey*

Those of you who were present at the 1975 Conference will recall that we spent some time discussing the Institute Report on the Beech Scheme. During that discussion an issue raised was whether we, as foresters, were competent to consider the social implications of the Schemes. I was surprised to find that several speakers thought that we were not and that foresters should not be concerned with social factors; they should not, as it were, bat outside their forestry crease on the resource management wicket. To me such a point of view is totally unacceptable and a negation of the role of foresters in society. So there and then I had the subject for my 1976 address — Forestry and Society. It is no coincidence that there is a course of that name in the curriculum for the Bachelor of Forestry Science degree at Canterbury. The social and sociological implications of forestry form a subject of great scope and complexity which few people are qualified to handle comprehensively and objectively, certainly not myself. But an understanding of it is so vitally important for effective forest management that it must be tackled, and by foresters because nobody else appears to be doing so in a practical way. And so I make this attempt, admittedly not comprehensive in a sociological sense, and sometimes subjective, to determine what people want and how some of their wants may best be supplied by our profession.

WHAT DO PEOPLE WANT?

What do people want? Before the question can be answered there must be some sort of understanding of what people are, a consideration which should have made me abandon this whole project; for comprehensive understanding of people seems properly beyond mortal insight. Those who do claim some special knowledge about the nature and behaviour of men tend often to disagree. However, this situation can be an encouragement to continue. If nobody knows all the answers, and if those who think that they know some of them disagree
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amongst themselves, then surely we can be permitted to develop a philosophy and a working hypothesis to enable more sensible decisions to be made about the use of forest resources. Anyway, this is the rationale for this attempt to present a forester's working view of his clients, the people for whom he manages forests. I must not try to set myself up as a sociologist, either a scholarly one or a homespun one. I am simply a generalist forester trying to recognise his ultimate objectives.

I have, of course, gone to authorities to learn something of their views on people and their behaviour. Most of these are sociologists and I have been impressed by the work of Robert Ardrey, a playwright turned anthropologist, even though it is criticised strongly by some social scientists. As I have said, there is disagreement among the social scientists about the nature and behaviour of men, but there are also large areas of agreement, or at least parallel views, and these have enabled me to make broad inferences. I present these with diffidence, but I shall proceed and construct a working hypothesis. And better a working hypothesis than no hypothesis at all; at least working hypotheses permit consistent decisions.

PEOPLE AS INDIVIDUALS

Despite the dogma of some idealists and the American Constitution, mankind is composed of unequal individuals. I can hardly sing a true note; yet many of you can sing superbly. One can think of myriad similar examples. The fundamental principle is not equality of capability, for this is patently absurd, but equality of opportunity which to me represents the highest kind of individual freedom. Indeed, it is claimed that the development of individuality has been the hallmark of western culture and, although many dispute it, that the development of government in modern democratic societies has, on the whole, resulted in increased freedom for the average person (9 - p. 465). On this premise, and if technology continues to provide both greater leisure and higher standards of living, such growth in individuality seems likely to continue (9 - p. 484). But for all his recent emancipation, man has spent almost all his history forced to hunt incessantly so that there are many attributes necessary for hunting built into his genotype, including aggression (3 - pp. 301, 337, 338). Morris (11) presents a "warts and all" picture of man as a human animal, masquerading as a civilized citizen, who is desperately trying to reconcile his awkward, inherited qualities with his new urban environment. I find convincing, at least in part, his view of Homo sapiens as a sort
of "Beverly Hillbilly", often out of place but trying to stay there.

Ardrey (3 — pp. 91, 289) claims that man has three innate needs which demand to be satisfied; the highest of these is identity, next is stimulation, and the lowest is security. He goes on to point out that the antitheses of these are, in order, anonymity, boredom and anxiety; what a familiar ring these three words have at the present time! The psychologist Maslow (in 9 — p. 49) describes man's innate needs rather differently; he says the most basic requirements are, in turn, physiological needs, the need for safety, "belongingness" and love, esteem, and finally realisation of one's potential in action. Other workers (9 — pp. 26-31) also acknowledge elemental physiological needs, including sexual gratification, and add physical safety. To these they link needs which are acquired rather than innate; which include power, material possessions, satisfaction of intellectual curiosity, peace of mind, aesthetic satisfaction and creative opportunities. Zweig (18) emphasises man's need for dignity and self-respect.

Some of these human needs are beyond the influence of forest management and we need not concern ourselves with them. But there appears to be a great deal of common ground, in the identification by authorities I have consulted, of human needs which can be provided, at least in part, by forestry, and these should demand our attention. It is possible, with some subjective manipulation, and without any implications of priority, to summarise them as security, stimulus, aesthetic satisfaction and creative activity. These are presented as relevant individual human needs, a blend of the innate and the cultivated, to form part of the working hypothesis. We shall come to them again soon, but before we do so we should look at man, not as an individual, but as a group member.

PEOPLE IN GROUPS

Considering man's individual wants is only part of the study. Man has been described as a social animal (15 — p. 75) who can develop his full potential only in societies. Again the experts present different concepts of societies. Wynn-Edwards (in 2 — pp. 172-3) defines a society as a group of individuals competing for conventional prizes by conventional means, a definition which implies that the game must be played so that the team as a whole does not get hurt. Ardrey (3 — p. 3) says that "a society is a group of unequal beings organized to meet common needs", the group providing individuals with equality of opportunity to develop their genetic potentials and so better serve the group. Reuter (13 — p. 209) states that
invention comes from individuals, who are encouraged and assisted by the group. Much of all this conforms to the theme of the social contract; society protects and nurtures the individual who, for his part, submits to the order of the group and respects the wants of other members of the group (3 — pp. 92, 101, 220). Gerhard and Jean Lenski point out that one of the tremendous advantages of societies is that they provide individuals with opportunities for education, which, of course, can only be to the long-term advantage of the group (9 — pp. 14, 16). Morris (11 — p. 23) expresses a common observation when he says that a universal characteristic of human groups is intra-group co-operation when facing outwards and intra-group competition when facing inwards, the former ensuring the security of the group, the latter ensuring the efficiency of the group. This closing of ranks in face of potential threats from outside the group is a trait which has been exploited by dictators and politicians for millennia. The aggregation of preservation organisations to protest against threats, real or exaggerated, to our indigenous forests is an example of such facing-outwards group behaviour.

We may rail about the universal drift to the cities but there is a point of view (3 — p. 218) that people cluster in cities because they want to, not because they have to. People do appear to enjoy the stimulus of cities, although they experience disadvantages, and major ones too. They tend to feel de-personalised in the cities and to lose their close association with other people. Zweig (18 — p. 137) says that, "the need and quest for fellowship are deeply ingrained in the human condition and they cannot be starved for long." (Morris (11 — pp. 20, 243) writes about man losing his identity living in a "super-tribe" and the need for him to retrieve his "village-community feeling of social identity". He goes on to suggest how, in an effort to gain status, would-be leaders, frustrated in the massive "super-tribes", compete for dominance in smaller sub-groups and cults (11 — p. 57). The development of such smaller voluntary sub-groups, where an individual can have “tribal” identity, is a feature of current urban life. It does not take a great amount of imagination to recognise the possibility of voluntary conservation organisations, and also professional societies, as constituting such sub-groups. Catton (6 — p. 77) recognises consummatory voluntary associations as being organised to help their members enjoy skiing, tramping, etc., and instrumental voluntary associations — conservation groups are good examples — which seek to influence public policies.

Allied with the formation of sub-groups is the emergence of a distinct culture of the young, which Sugarman (15 — p. 64) says is a new phenomenon in Britain. The basic aspira-
tions of youth groups — resistance to adult authority and desire for fun and excitement — remain constant from year to year, but the way in which these aspirations are expressed changes constantly. The Lenskis (9 — p. 407) say that this appears to be a deliberate strategy to keep the adults continually at a distance; they can never learn the new rules in time to catch up. Sugarman (15 — p. 72) points out that another trait of the young is an emphasis on spontaneous gratification in contrast to the conventional emphasis on deferred gratification. They prefer to live for the moment than to work hard now for rewards later. (Perhaps the dissatisfaction of the “oldies” is tinged with jealousy.) Morris (11 — p. 61) says that a new feature of “super-tribes” is that age classes are emerging with a widening gap between “young adults and old adults”. An extreme manifestation of a distinct youth culture in modern democratic societies is the violent student demonstration which, suggests Turner (17 — p. 328), could be due to initially ingenuous ideas about politics and the recognition later of the gap between the ideal and reality.

Now the relevance of these sub-groups in the current context is that different ones look at forest resources in different ways and have different preferences about forest management. Young adults will tend to use national parks and State forest parks in different ways from old adults. Cattoa (6 — p. 89) presents data which suggest that people with an urban upbringing tend to set higher store on wilderness values than people with a rural upbringing. Also, he demonstrates, so do those with higher educational attainments. There is stratification even within the sub-groups. Fairbrother (in 14 — p. 331) divides members of amenity societies into three classes: “reversers” who want to put the clock back to the “beautiful” pre-industrial world; “shunters” who accept the unsightly developments of the modern industrial state but who do not want to live next to them; and “translators” who propose to accept such industrial developments but to introduce them so that the least harm, or even benefit, accrues to the environment. In a study of the conservation movement in the United States, Harry et al. (in 14 — p. 328) point out that the movement appears to be made up largely of upper-middle-class people with professional occupations. It is important for the forest manager to be able to recognise the different sub-groups which impinge upon his management, and the differing sets of values which they hold.

Now the working hypothesis can be advanced to the stage where we can look in more detail at the human needs recognised earlier and consider how they relate to forestry. These needs can be regarded as searches which motivate human
behaviour: a search for security, a search for stimulus, a search for aesthetic satisfaction and a search for creative activity.

THE SEARCH FOR SECURITY

There are three elements in the search for security: economic security, environmental stability and, although the connection may seem tenuous initially, personal space and privacy. Surely there is little need here to elaborate on the first. The indicative planning which has resulted from the two Forestry Development Conferences and which is summarised quantitatively in the National Planning Model, shows how the production and processing of wood to satisfy both domestic and overseas markets can contribute significantly to national wealth and individual well-being. There is some opposition to the planned forest development. The proponents of zero growth press for a reduction in the proposed afforestation programmes. I do not wish to get involved in this argument in this address, save to reiterate a general point of view which I put forward at the Conference last year. Before we can achieve zero industrial growth (which we must do eventually), we must achieve, more or less on a global scale, zero population growth. Because this is an impossibility in the short term, industrial growth must continue for the present. As the non-renewable raw materials so useful for our technology and culture become depleted, they can only be replaced by renewable raw materials, amongst which wood will be prominent, even dominant. It is possible, indeed it is likely, that next century civilisation will be scrabbling for resources of energy and consumable or fabricating materials. The obligations for forestry are clear: as much wood as possible must be provided commensurate with least harm to environmental and social values.

Again there is little need, before this audience, to plead for that stewardship of forest resources which will achieve a stable environment. The need to protect environmental values is now being pressed by many conservation organisations with skill, articulateness and sometimes with an element of unscrupulousness. But do not forget that this Institute was well in the van of the conservation movement in New Zealand with the submission, in 1957, of a most comprehensive statement to the Parliamentary Select Committee on Soil Conservation and Rivers Control. The Institute recognised then, as is more widely appreciated today, that the prime objective in mountain-land management in New Zealand is to keep the vegetative cover as complete and thrifty as possible so that erosion remains at a natural minimum, the
drainage channels are kept stable, and aggradation on the flood plains, where human investment is concentrated, is minimised. Similarly, there is no need to elaborate on the importance of controlling effluent from wood processing so that air, land and water ecosystems are not despoiled. I would expect that most of you here would accept the relevant principle proposed at the November session of the recent Forestry Development Conference (10) that, "In the disposal from wood processing into air, land and water environments, the principal objective should be that ecosystems do not become overloaded with more waste material than they can absorb and so do not deteriorate significantly in quality." This approach implies survey before the establishment of mills and monitoring when they are running.

Economic and environmental aspects have been accorded priority in man's search for security, and understandably so. But there is another aspect which is not so obvious but which has received a great deal of attention in recent years, largely due to Ardrey who in 1967 published a convincing and widely-acclaimed book, *The Territorial Imperative*. In it he demonstrated persuasively the importance of the human instinct to possess and defend territory. Later, in another widely read book, Ardrey (3 — pp. 227, 233, 240) develops this theme to the recognition of human need for personal space, and also for social space which tends to be denied by urbanisation. A similar idea is promoted by Morris (11 — p. 40) who says that all those who live in cities suffer from mild claustrophobia. This need for individual space seems, ultimately, to be part of the need for security; without adequate individual space we find it hard to live in mental comfort. The search for personal space — it is akin to a search for privacy — can be seen at holiday time in any camping ground in any domain, national park or State forest park as recreational users cherish their camping sites and exhibit, or conceal, resentment at the incursion of late-comers on to their privacy. Obvious implications for the management of recreational forests are the skilful planning of camp-grounds, with well-defined site boundaries and the provision of vegetative screens for privacy. Also necessary is the restriction of numbers in recreational areas which receive particularly heavy use, as much for the peace of mind of the human user as for the protection of the site itself.

THE SEARCH FOR STIMULUS

We can observe in our friends and associates some who are over-stimulated and some who are not stimulated enough.
We all need some stimulus but the ideal requirement is that each individual receives the amount of stimulation appropriate for him, which will depend on many attributes, including his age and the spurring he receives in his work-a-day world. Morris (11—p. 180) writes of the “stimulus struggle” and explains that the individual’s aim is to get the optimum amount of stimulus from his environment—i.e., somewhere between over-stimulation and under-stimulation. Many individuals in urban societies, often the older person who is extended in holding down a demanding job and maintaining the status associated with it, does not need further stimulus. His need is not so much for excitement as for serenity. He needs the beauty and tranquillity of forest lands, especially the national parks and State forest parks, to help reduce his tensions and restore his perspectives. Because this type of person is older he will be less hardy physically and will require facilities of access and accommodation if he is to be able to use to the full the recreational opportunities in these forests which he needs. If he does require a measure of stimulus, it may well be provided by study, to varying depths, of aspects of nature which surround him. Catton (5—p. 7) infers that, “wilderness use is motivated to a substantial degree by the intellectual puzzles nature presents to the human visitor.” It is virtually impossible to estimate the proportion of the New Zealand population which falls within the category of the over-stimulated man but we can note that 28% of the people are 45 years or older (1).

On the other hand, the need for stimulus on the part of the young and those older people who are under-stimulated in their jobs is a force to be reckoned with. If not met in constructive and socially-acceptable ways, it can erupt in ways that all of us here find reprehensible, in violence and other aberrant manifestations. The court notes in the newspapers provide many examples of this. And we should remember that aggression is regarded by some social scientists as being a prominent part of the human genotype. Catton (6—p. 84) suggests that a quest for uncertainty is one of the motivations of people who are attracted to the recreational use of wilderness areas. He cites research undertaken by Emerson as a member of a team climbing Mt Everest. Emerson found that, if success seemed highly probable or if failure seemed highly probable, there was less motivation in the team. When there was genuine uncertainty about success or failure, motivation was high. This inference rings true when one thinks of the many young people who use our remote mountain-lands in holiday time, relishing testing their mettle against untouched environments, enjoying the uncertainty. Again,
while acknowledging that it is virtually impossible to estimate the proportion of the population which is understimulated in this way, we can note that the 15-29 age class forms 24% of the population.

In this respect I join with Bruce Watson (pers. comm.) in suggesting that the managers of mountain-lands have often gone too far in providing river-crossings, good tracks and comfortable huts. The provision of these facilities has to a large extent removed the uncertainty from living and travelling in the mountain-lands. Assuredly they have been made safer but, also as pointed out by Bruce Watson, an undesirable consequence has been that many young people have not had to learn how to cross rivers, how to find their way across untracked terrain and how to fly-camp. The acquisition of these skills is ultimately the best way of achieving safety in the mountains. By stopping the provision of further of these facilities, perhaps even by removing some of those which are already established, we can ensure that the innate human need for excitement and uncertainty can be satisfied. We ignore this need at our peril and it seems to me that we have leaned too far towards a well-intentioned but unrealistic, protective attitude.

The forest management problem is how to accommodate both those who seek tranquillity with facilities and those who seek excitement without them. Some sort of zoning is the obvious answer and of course this is being instituted in part with the establishment of wilderness areas. But I suspect that the wilderness areas are being proclaimed without a very clear idea of the areal proportion they should constitute to meet the needs of the stimulus seekers. What seems to be needed is the development of a system of quality classification for recreational areas of forests which would take into account the differing wants of various groups and sub-groups of the community and their respective proportions.

Perhaps the approach I have taken in relation to satisfying the search for stimulus has been too conservative — too square and too simple. The assumption has been that recreational benefits in the forests comprise only those related directly to the forest and the site. There could be other sources of stimulus in forests. Richardson (14 — p. 329) suggests that in Great Britain a predominantly urban population will want urban recreational facilities when it visits the forests. He suggests that foresters should be resort managers rather than resource managers, and describes the provision in Danish forests of such urban delights as strip-tease joints. I am not qualified to comment on strip-tease joints but there
is much that is sound in his general theme; this point of view must be taken into account.

THE SEARCH FOR AESTHETIC SATISFACTION

The introduction of good landscaping into forest management, so that the forest stands are themselves appealing in a visual sense, and so that they fit well into the total landscape, can provide a lot of aesthetic satisfaction for the rural traveller. Indeed, I believe that this aspect of forestry is becoming so important that all comprehensive forestry courses should include formal tuition in landscaping principles.

Afforestation with pure radiata pine in localities where the landscaping effect is particularly important, as within the visual corridor of a main highway, may not provide good landscape. Yet a deliberate diversification of species through the use of attractive slower-growing species in key places to give visual variety and visual stability as proposed by Challenger (7), or through an attractively scalloped roadside margin studded with small hardwood groups, may leaven the radiata pine matrix to give an impressive landscaping effect. It must be conceded that, usually, landscaping input reduces wood output; there is a resultant reduction in wood production due to admixtures of species less productive than radiata pine, or to a net reduction in the productive area due to forest being planted short of the inevitably straight legal boundary. Such a reduction in productivity may be of the order of 5 to 10%. A comparable figure which has been suggested for amenity forests in the Taupo District is 25% (7, p. 210). But few would deny the justification, in terms of optimal land use, of some reduction in wood productivity for the sake of good landscape.

General environmental benefits like good landscaping must be paid for. Thomson (16 — p. 215) has laid down, inter alia, the sound dictum that, “The community rather than the forest owner or buyer of stumpage should pay for social forestry benefits when these have involved extra expenditure”. In the case of State forestry there is no problem about who pays; it is the taxpayer. In the case of private forestry it seems only reasonable for the taxpayer to compensate the forest owner for his loss in productivity or his increased costs. A system of scenic easements with owners receiving recompense from the public purse was suggested as a general environmental measure at the 1970 Physical Environment Conference. It should not be too difficult to apply this principle to the management of private production forests.
THE SEARCH FOR CREATIVE ACTIVITY

Many people have jobs which are not satisfying in a creative sense; the basic tragedy is that their genetic potentials are not being realised and they search for opportunities. Here is a large untapped human resource, some of which could be funnelled into forestry. Surely we have the wit to develop ways and means for this. I am not thinking about the normal duties and responsibilities associated with growing wood, fire protection, animal control, etc. I am thinking of the myriad, non-revenue bearing but important, aspects of forest management which affect environmental quality. For instance, why should not a forest manager approach a branch of the Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society and ask them to undertake a programme to improve bird habitat in an exotic production forest by distributing and maintaining bird nesting boxes. In return a small regular donation could be made to the branch's funds and the participants could be given some rights of entry into the forest. There are many such opportunities to absorb people's creative capacities in forestry.

Indeed an important start has already been made in this direction with the commencement of the practice of consulting the public about forest management plans before final decisions are made. Here the public has the opportunity of being creative by advising what should be done and how it should be done. Good examples are the beech schemes and the environmental impact reports associated with afforestation and hydro-electric schemes.

It may seem to the planners that more brick-bats are thrown than bouquets; perhaps they are, but nevertheless many creative suggestions have been made and adopted. The advisory committees for the various State forest parks, and the various national park boards enable creative contributions by honorary workers who strive to enhance forest management. Perhaps the most important feature is that those members of the public, who have the inclination to make creative contributions, are enabled to do so in a manner which enables them to identify with the management of the forest. And finally, in this context, we should look to a mote in our own eye before we concern ourselves with one in our brother's eye. In his predictions about production forestry in the 1980s Bunn (4 — p. 184) warned that we shall have to make some jobs in forestry more satisfying for the workers. Many are unacceptably monotonous and uninspiring.

THE PREFERENCE FOR EGOALITARIANISM

There is a feature which is a characteristic of the New Zealand way of life and which is indicative of the socio-
cultural stage of our development. Collette (8 — p. 42) points out the strong tendency to homogeneity and egalitarianism that is a distinctive feature of New Zealand society. It is not always consistent but it exists to the extent that most of us are aware of it and delight in it. It conforms to that fundamental requirement for individual freedom which we considered at the outset: equality of opportunity for the individual. Most likely it has its origins in the frontier-type history of our country. Gerhard and Jean Lenski (9 — p. 261) acknowledge that innovations become accepted and old rigidities disappear in frontier areas so that a highly egalitarian pattern of small farms is likely to develop. But, they also point out that, as the frontier becomes developed, traditional social patterns begin to assert themselves unless this is prevented by the introduction of industrialisation. This has been partly the New Zealand sequence so perhaps we can ascribe our degree of homogeneity and egalitarianism to an amalgam of an industrialised urban society and a highly mechanised agrarian society. Whatever the causal complex, we have the good fortune to live in a comparatively classless democracy where privilege is not entrenched. As a result, our society seeks its leisure and recreation in an egalitarian and democratic way.

This national attitude is reflected in the absence of exclusive rights and privileges for any individual or section of the community on publicly-owned forest land, and rightly so. Some years ago there was a great deal of discussion about the building of private holiday homes in State forests, along the lines of the privately-owned summer homes in the American National Forests. Fortunately these have never eventuated and the climate of opinion now seems to be even cooler towards them. Inevitably these would have become heritable and transferable with consequent speculation and a tendency for benefits and rights to accrue unfairly to wealthier people. The danger appears to be well past with regard to private holiday homes in publicly-owned forests but there are other hazards. There is always the risk of groups of sportsmen obtaining exclusive hunting rights over sectors of State forests or national parks, more likely de facto than de jure, but exclusive rights nevertheless. There is also the danger of feral game animals being husbanded on Crown leasehold retired from grazing for the exclusive enjoyment of tourists. These are features which must be carefully watched, especially now that we seem to be a little closer to some form of game management of deer.

This, then, is my working hypothesis. Regrettably I have had to cover this complex field in short order so that the
treatment has been only preliminary, indeed skimpy, but I have covered the main points of my own philosophy. I believe that our prime obligation to New Zealand society is to help its members in their pursuit of security, stimulus, aesthetic satisfaction, creative activity and egalitarianism. You may accept it or you may not. Whether you do or do not is not really highly important. What is important, may I respectfully suggest, is that each of us has an explicit working hypothesis which, from regular and careful examination, he considers suited to the comprehensive forestry needs of his fellow New Zealanders. Then I am sure that we shall be able to make better decisions about the management of our forest resources. People are our business as much as trees.
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