

SINGLE-USE VERSUS MULTIPLE-USE FORESTRY.

To-day's side issues of forestry have been stated—from tree-planting and timber-production down the whole gamut of uses to scenic and recreational development. One and all they are a reflection of other days when villages had to have their grazing, the nobles their hunting, the iron-masters their charcoal, the glass furnaces and the salt "wiches" their fuel, and the king his navy. This was the single-use type of forest management which population pressure has long since replaced with multiple-use management. A few Royal parks and similar reserves of limited area are all that are left in most of the older civilized countries as a relic of those times. Virtually the whole of their forest lands are on a multiple-purpose basis. Only by putting the non-agricultural or forest lands to a multiplicity of uses can forestry be made of the greatest possible service to the community. Seldom is it possible to put individual forest areas to the entire range of uses. Often some uses conflict, but it is rare that a number cannot be harmonized and forests managed for the development of numerous social and economic values, provided, of course, that the fatal error of multiplicity of authorities over the same area is avoided.

Multiple-use management and unification of control must therefore be the essence of New Zealand forestry. Already it has been typified in the management of the kauri forests. Timber-production is taken care of by the preservation and tending of young and advanced growth, and by the ordered cutting of dead and dying trees; historic, scientific, and scenic interest by reservation of strips on frequented public roads and of individual trees or clumps of extraordinary size, beauty, or distinction in whatever part of the forests they may occur; and watershed-protection by the re-establishment of kauri on old cut-over forests. Silvicultural management and fire-protection are assisting to achieve all these (Plates Nos. 1-6). It is real forestry—the perpetuation of kauri forest as a living, healthy, productive, and reproductive community. Can the alternative of single-use mismanagement be seriously considered—the locking-up of the remaining kauri forest, without timber yield but with slow yet inevitable replacement of kauri by taraire and even more inferior species—all in the sole interests of historic and scenic values? It is confidently anticipated that the public would regard such a proposal as untenable.

At the same time the general policy of multiple-use is not rigidly pursued to the complete exclusion of single-use forestry. The State Forest Service has for many years made substantial additions to and assisted in the administration and protection of scenic reserves and national parks originally sponsored and still managed by the Department of Lands and Survey. The feeling of the public that a certain number of these single-use forests should be kept divorced from any ordinary forest areas on which other types of management may be imposed appears to be a very real one, doubtless a feeling of sanctity of purpose which might otherwise be violated.

OBJECTIVE VERSUS METHODS.

The kauri controversy is typical of single-use side issues in forestry. Almost invariably they arise from confusion between objective and method. Organizations, no less than individuals, are most concerned regarding those broad facts directly touching their own interests, and ordinarily their major activity is the support of what appears to be the immediate remedy. Cause and effect not being properly related by those concerned, the apparently obvious remedy becomes the objective rather than the means to an end. It is bad enough that this should tend to develop a single-use-forestry complex, but what is even more regrettable is that it serves to obscure entirely the realities of the national problem and its solution. What of the planting of trees, if browsed by deer or burnt by fire or if the wood they produce be wastefully used? What of locking up high forests for watershed protection, whilst scrub areas elsewhere are being continually fired? The answer to these and to an infinite variety of similar questions is that the national objective is obscured by a haze of multitudinous remedies.

Yet of its very simplicity, the national forestry objective should stand forth unobscured and command the support of every section of the community. "By keeping in a state of maximum productivity its non-agricultural lands, forestry through the maintenance of climatic equilibrium, regulation of stream flow and