Karl Schasching’s sterling services

Last November the President presented Karl Schasching with a framed certificate, to express the appreciation of the Institute for his sterling services as Secretary of the Canterbury Branch over the past 20 years, and also for the steady help he had long provided to FORSOC.

Karl is a graduate of the Austrian technical forestry school at Bruck au der Mur. He is a fourth-generation forester, the tradition in his family being for the oldest son always to enter forestry. He started forestry work in New Zealand in 1962 at Hanmer and he recalls with pleasure then coming down to Christchurch to attend the friendly meetings of the Canterbury Branch under the chairmanship of Arthur Cooney. He joined the parent body in 1970 and four years later became Secretary to the Canterbury Branch.

After Hanmer he had a spell with the DSIR at Lincoln until he was appointed as technician to the staff of the new Canterbury School of Forestry in 1970. He has made an important contribution to the development of the School, rising to his current position of Senior Technical officer. Twenty-six annual intake of students remember Karl well, and kindly too, especially through the practical courses in which he played a prominent part. He always encouraged students to join the Institute and probably has signed up more new members than anybody else. In 1984 he was awarded an ANZAC Fellowship to visit and study the Canberra, Melbourne and Creswick, Australian forestry schools.

Karl has always been a field forester. And he has long had a passion for hunting, which started with his training in Austria where the subject is an important part of a forester’s course. He has stalked deer on the Canterbury and Westland hills for many years, and climbed high too to take chamois and tahr. He has been a member of the New Zealand Deerstalkers’ Association for 25 years. He was a member of the National Recreational Hunting Advisory Committee, which did much for private hunting, from its inception in 1979 until 1989 when it fell victim to the broadside fired by the Labour Government against quangos. He is currently a member of the Mountain Safety Council.

Peter McKelvey

Why a Maori name?

The Annual General Meeting in Rotorua adopted Te Putahi Ngaherehere o Aotearoa as the Maori version of New Zealand Institute of Forestry. Although it is after the fact, the question of why this is being done is still pertinent because this will influence how we progress from this point. Two approaches can be taken to answering the question, one pragmatically and the other philosophically.

Of New Zealand’s 1.4 million hectares of exotic production forest some 200,000 hectares are under Maori ownership. Claims before the Waitangi Tribunal could increase this figure to 500,000 hectares in the next few years. Maori ownership predominates in the nation’s 1.4 million hectare private indigenous forest estate.

So, in pragmatic terms, the integrated development of forestry in Aotearoa/New Zealand demands full involvement of Maori forests alongside those of the corporates, farmers and other private investors. Maori forestry is already a significant contributor to the nation’s economic base and will become even more significant in the future.

But how does a Maori name for the Institute help?

The Institute represents the forestry profession of New Zealand. But is it representing the forestry profession of Aotearoa/New Zealand? Forestry in New Zealand is a profession which has especially drawn Maori people. Most Pakeha in the profession can remember starting their work rubbing shoulders with Maori and benefiting from their enthusiasm and insights.

But if we consider the membership of the Institute, Pakeha members overwhelmingly outweigh Maori members. So is the Maori voice being heard in the decision-making forums of the Institute? Are Maori perspectives being taken on board when decisions are being made on use of land, forest and water?

The Treaty of Waitangi guaranteed protection by the governing body of the nation of Maori taonga — land, forests and fisheries. How then can governing bodies know what Maori taonga are, let alone appropriate use of them, unless the Maori perspective is being heard?

For Pakeha, who have been the privileged majority in the society of Aotearoa/New Zealand and who have enjoyed governing activities their way, it is difficult to start seriously listening to what Maori know and believe. Pakeha foresters draw on 400 years of forestry knowledge and tradition, of which less than 100 years of practice is in New Zealand. Maori draw on 1000 years of knowledge of experience with Aotearoa forests. Obviously there are gains to be made in shared understandings.

So the Institute has been faced with the question of where to start.
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