

during the years 1954-58. Although only preliminary in scope and application they nevertheless exhibit considerable divergence from the phenological characteristics of the same species overseas. Correlation of these observations with other districts can be effected through such widely-dispersed clonal lines as Lombardy poplar, weeping willows and the hybrid Schreiner poplars. Greater precision of dating can be achieved by using a group of individuals (differing slightly each from the others) to give an easily defined comparative datum, rather than one based solely on personal judgement of one instant in a more-or-less continuous process.

## CORRESPONDENCE

### GENETICS IN SILVICULTURE

The Editor,  
N.Z. Journal of Forestry.

Dear Sir,

In reading through Vol. VII, No. 4 of your excellent journal, I encountered a review of GENETICS IN SILVICULTURE by C. Syrach Larsen. I think that your reviewer has devoted far too much time to the translator and his attitude to genetics, of which your reviewer is entirely ignorant, and far too little to that of the author. I am not aware that I have ever claimed to be a geneticist but I do make some pretension to be a silviculturist and the reason why I agreed, after considerable hesitation, to translate Dr Larsen's work, was that I thought that it would be an extremely valuable work for the practising silviculturist. Not being a geneticist, I could not presume to know whether geneticists would think so highly of it. What my own attitude towards the relationship of genetics to silviculture is, I have not expressed in print so far as I am aware.

In fairness to Dr Larsen, I would say that after considerable discussion with him about the title, I persuaded him to adopt that of "Genetics in Silviculture" for the very simple reason that the book, in my opinion, was excellently written to put before non-geneticists the present position in respect of forest tree breeding. Anyone reading the book will admit, I think, that Dr Larsen does definitely suggest that genetics may have a place in silviculture. Your reviewer unfor-

tunately quotes from the Preface only part of a sentence and leaves the second equally important part out. Perhaps the youthfulness of New Zealand forestry is the explanation for that omission. New Zealand foresters have not yet had so much time to lose, and, if they read Dr Larsen's work, I feel sure that they will lose no time.

I am, Sir,

Yours faithfully,

Mark L. Anderson,  
Professor.

Department of Forestry,  
10 George Square,  
Edinburgh, 8  
28 March 1958

The reviewer, Mr C. M. Smith, writes: "Thank you for the opportunity of having a pre-publication perusal of Prof. Anderson's letter. His admissions in it are both candid and handsome, and your reviewer is correspondingly grateful. As translator, Prof. Anderson admits that he "persuaded" Dr Larsen to adopt the title GENETICS IN SILVICULTURE only after "considerable discussion". He goes on to say that the book "put before non-geneticists the present position in respect of forest tree-breeding", and was "excellently written" for this purpose. Your reviewer welcomes this opportunity of agreeing with Prof. Anderson about the contents and the purpose of the book; but regrets that Dr Larsen allowed himself to be persuaded to use the misleading title. He has read many articles from Dr Larsen's pen, and he had the benefit and the pleasure of discussing Dr Larsen's work with him in New Zealand some years ago. Nothing impressed him more than Dr Larsen's studious avoidance of any claim to be a geneticist, and his constant reference to his work as "forest tree-breeding". The point is not a trivial one. Neglect of it in other fields of plant culture in other lands has given rise to resounding and unedifying controversies in scientific, administrative and even political circles. It would now appear from Prof. Anderson's statement that he persuaded Dr Larsen to depart from his well-tried habit, and to put, if one may dare to invert Scripture, old wine (and a good wine it was) into a new bottle; or at least into a bottle with a new label.

One need not labour the point further. Prof. Anderson will, one is sure, not only admit but sturdily claim that the motto "True to Label" is one to which no exception can be countenanced. On that at least, Scotland and New Zealand have ever been in agreement especially in the matter of their respective commercially important, saleable, consumable products. Even as this is being written, the post has delivered a periodical which opened at random at an article by Pro. Anderson on the Seventh British Forestry Conference in September last in Australia. There he lists amongst the main matters of debate the "application of Tree-Breeding in Forestry". With this title,

the reviewer would have been well content, but he cannot admit, or believe, that it is synonymous with GENETICS IN SILVICULTURE.

Would it be too presumptuous for the reviewer to ask Prof. Anderson to accept this most remarkable coincidence as a direct response by a kind of *sortes Virgilianae* to be interpreted "*Quandoque bonus dormitat Homerus*"?

The Editor,  
N.Z. Journal of Forestry.

Sir,

#### FOREST LAYOUT

At the Institute's 1958 Conference, three admirable papers were presented on the subject of forest layout and species siting. Each approached the subject from a different point of view, viz. general forest management, species siting, and logging requirements. I felt that they did not altogether arrive at the same conclusions apart from a general agreement that the ideal compartment size should lie somewhere between 10 and 80 acres. The discussion that followed showed too that there was some variation in general points of view. Having had the opportunity to read, before publication, Prior's article on the Balmoral fire, I would draw your attention to his recommendations which put forward a most convincing and valid argument for laying out and sub-dividing a forest on the basis of fire protection. And fire protection in Canterbury and some other parts of New Zealand must be of prime importance. This further emphasises how difficult it is to reconcile the best forest layout with all the requirements of management ideals, species siting, soil types, topography, logging, wind damage, fire protection, and forest hygiene.

I feel that no hard and fast rules can be laid down for New Zealand, or anywhere else for that matter, but only the broad principles. The forester laying out a new forest, or altering the layout of an old one, must know his area well and be able to analyse the most important factors which will influence his layout. Then it will be those factors which will guide him in his forest plan as he cannot hope to satisfy them all.

Throughout New Zealand's forest history, forest layout has been influenced in turn by ideal species siting, the use of a multiplicity of species and mixtures, the magnitude of the job, fire protection, logging, and more recently forest hygiene, just like changing fashions. I feel a cautionary note should be sounded that a forester should not be biased by fashions; he must know and solve his main local problems first, whatever they are. There is still a lot of truth in the old saying that "Forestry is an art and not a science".

Yours, etc.,

A. W. Grayburn.

Darfield,  
7 July 1958.

Editor,  
N.Z. Journal of Forestry.

Sir,

### STRIPLING

The term *stripling* seems to be becoming more widely used, particularly by those working in beech, to describe a stage in tree development between *seedling* and *sapling*. Though the word is apt and fills a gap in our silvicultural terminology, it is not given in this sense in any forest terminology that I have seen.

However, *stripling* is listed in the British Commonwealth Forest Terminology, Part I, and is there defined as "a sapling grown in a nursery, stripped of its leaves and branches and sometimes root-pruned, before planting out". The word in this sense is apparently a local usage in Uganda. This too is a good word for a process not used as much as it might be and, now that eucalypt has ceased to be a dirty word amongst New Zealand foresters, we do need a term to describe it.

Dictionaries do not appear to recognise the term in the second sense, though etymologically it should be admissible. As it would be confusing to retain the same word for the two ideas, can anyone suggest a satisfactory alternative for either?

Yours faithfully,

G. H. HOCKING

Palmerston North.  
10th July, 1958.