

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

FORESTRY LITERACY

Sir,— I have tried, on several occasions, to bring to the attention of your readers that foresters are illiterate in their own technical language. Apparently, my pleas have fallen on deaf ears. Presumably the forestry schools no longer teach their students the correct meaning of technical forestry terms. As Editor of the *Journal*, you are no less casual; in the latest issue (28 (3), page 367) we have “. . . schedules of activities . . . covering new planting, silviculture and harvesting” (and this is only one example in this issue).

As I have noted before, if foresters cannot use their own language correctly, we cannot expect the general public to understand us.

Clearly, the NZIF does not care two hoots; but I shall, as a last despairing attempt to rectify the position, draw their attention to the Orwellian thesis about language as exemplified in the novel *1984*.

Now I shall retire, like Voltaire, to horticulture my garden.

C. G. R. CHAVASSE
Rotorua

ECONOMICS OF EARLY CLEARFELLING

Sir,— Most of the points raised by Andrès Katz in his letter (Vol. 29 (1), p. 149) have been covered in the original paper.

It would, of course, be perfectly feasible to continue the analysis for an infinite series of silviculturally “optimal” rotations (thereby equalizing the terminal point at infinity) but it was stressed (p. 164) that, at the high contemporary rates of discount, the quantitative differences are slight. This situation also applies to the expensive land preparation costs mentioned by Katz, where these occur in subsequent rotations, although of course the expense of pruning may lead to extended rotations required for sufficient premium-priced clearwood to be laid down after occlusion.

The paper emphasises the present value at the moment of decisions, the situation at the end of the existing rotation under the “*laissez-faire*” choice is a new time with new circumstances and is theoretically another opportunity for new decisions. Differ-