

management of the forest in these countries, but also in the treatment of its own natural forest.

President Peter Olsen, in reviewing the question as to whether the Institute should sign the Forest Accord, has drawn attention to perceived problems arising from the East Coast afforestation scheme. Yet, surely, these problems are overstated.

The East Coast project, as a government-funded scheme, has three separate purposes. They are: the political (to massage the Government's ego), the economic and social (to provide employment and regional development benefits from planting new protection/production forests); and the environmental (to control and repair a catastrophic erosion problem that has acquired world-wide notoriety). It is the proposal to achieve the last aim partly by clearfelling and converting to production species much of the existing kanuka forests and manuka shrublands, which is supposedly straining the Forest Accord.

Yet the NZ Forest Research Institute, in its submission on the project, noted that kanuka/manuka communities of eight years old or greater are as effective as fully-stocked radiata stands in stabilising erodable landscapes. Moreover, for at least six years after cutting and burning such kanuka/manuka, the land will be highly susceptible to erosion. The NZFRI report concludes: "It makes little sense, and certainly not conservation sense, to follow this course of action where other better options are available".

Vice-President Jolyon Manning, referring to Council's current review of the Institute's mission statement, has reiterated that the primary goals of the professional foresters are the promotion of excellence in forestry management in terms of both the care and stewardship of the inherited indigenous forests with their vital role in soil and water conservation, and the practice of good silvicultural principles in the pursuit of sustainable and productive commercial plantations.

If the forestry profession is to improve its still badly tarnished image with the general public, and I would also suggest its own self-image as a responsible professional body, it is essential that it does not compromise its principles. Surely, there is no way that the primary goals stated above can be regarded as incompatible with the undertakings accepted in the Forest Accord.

Multipurpose forestry, as first understood in parts of Europe, was probably the world's oldest environmental science. For too long politicians and others have tried to subvert it into an exploitative concept for achieving short-term and narrow objectives.

The Institute should sign the Forest Accord.

**Eric Bennett**

## The Forest Accord

Sir,

Ket Smith's note in the February issue on why the Institute should sign the Forest Accord is little more than a wimpish grovel to parlour-green soul salving.

The Accord is an agreement between parties whose members, on both sides, have clearcut objectives; they have agreed to stay off each other's turf and to get out of each other's hair in areas where they are most likely to fight. Fair enough; most of us would agree with that.

But the key factor is that the signatories on both sides are all large and prosperous, and both sides can sit back and bask in mutual admiration of their sensitivity without any great real cost to anyone.

We are now getting another view of the Accord, a view aptly described by the saying that when elephants fight small people get squashed; the Accord that we are asked to support is now being used as a hammer to bash down people who have no resources other than their land and who have so far been left on the fringes of society, bypassed by the benefits that the rest of us take for granted.

We have just, in the past few days, seen Tasman Forestry pull out of their reforestation agreement with Ngati Porou because of an inability to reach a compromise, in terms of the Accord, over what is kanuka and what is not. Ngati Porou have set aside 30% of their land as reserve, but a section of the conservationist movement, led by the Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society, say it must be 50%.

In justification, their official, Kevin Smith, said on national radio that there is plenty of other land outside tribal land which needs planting, and if they want work, Ngati Porou can go there. He also said that the Forest and Bird campaign would continue if they found some "foreign ratbag" as a partner in place of Tasman Forestry.

Now the Ngati Porou can of course carry on being hewers of wood and drawers of water for other people, as Mr Smith suggests, and of course they can continue as clients of the Department of Social Welfare and the Justice Department, but I gather that they would rather make more of their lives and stand on their own feet.

I support their efforts to do just that and I do not agree that this Institute (or

indeed any other organisation to which I belong) should be a party in any way to any agreement which leads to such arrogant, not to say racist behaviour.

As an individual I support the philosophy behind the Accord, as I imagine most members of the Institute do, and I see it as an excellent basis on which issues of conflict may be resolved.

Unfortunately it is clear that this is not the view of an influential group within the conservation movement, who seem to have a Serbian attitude that talk and agreement is merely a way of gaining time to bully.

Individuals are of course free to do as they think best, but the Institute itself should not be a party to the Forest Accord until there is more evidence than at present of the sense of community and social responsibility of some on the conservation side.

The decision to sign must be decided by a referendum of all members, not by Council or by a vote at the AGM.

**John Purey-Cust**

## Should the Institute sign the Forest Accord?

Sir,

Ket Bradshaw (Smith) referred in her article to "regenerating shrubland". This prompts two comments.

Firstly the "regenerating scrubland" mostly occurs on Conserved Land, conserved under Acts usually initiated by the (increasingly fondly remembered) NZ Forest Service.

Secondly much "regenerating scrubland" at present contains no individuals of New Zealand timber species that grow for a long time. If there are no individuals now, how will there ever be any "in the fullness of time"? That is unless such species are deliberately planted (the Conservation Lobby would hold "with malice aforethought"!).

**K.D. Marten**

## A call for legal redress

Sir,

By publishing that disgusting photo on page 6 of the last issue you have allowed the journal to descend to a new low.

It is bad enough when HRHs the