Subject: : Conservation
Topic: : Post your favorite conservation quotes
Re: Post your favorite conservation quotes
Author: : pcray1231
Date: : 2009/12/16 15:00:21
URL:

Quote:

> The downside is that if we agree that logging is BETTER for our forests than preservation, what reason would there be not to log every inch of forest left in PA, every inch of forest left in the Eastern United States?

Because logging IN ALL FORMS is not better for our forests, it is only better when done in moderation, in certain areas, and when well regulated. That means there needs to be rules regarding roadbuilding and maintenance, location of logging (such as not near streams and such), species and age of trees being harvested, maximum area, etc. Believe it or not, these regulations exist, and I'm not against strengthening them. Overall, the logging companies (and regulators) do a pretty good job these days on public lands, which obviously was not always the case. There is still abuse on private lands.

Quote:

> don't try and tell me that logging is better for the health of the ecosystem than what nature will do on it's own.

Thats exactly what I'm saying. Long term (>1000 years) its a wash either way, but short term the well regulated logging route is clearly superior for the health of the ecosystem.

Quote:

> The entire concept of preservation hinges on that idea that an ecosystem NOT used for logging or drilling is a better ecosystem than the one being used

I couldn't disagree more. 1st, I don't think anyone could say drilling is good for the local environment. We can discuss the degree of "badness", and whether its better than the alternatives, but noone would say there is an actual benefit to the local ecosystem from the act of drilling. 2nd, the concept of preservation, for me, means ensuring that the quality of the land and water is preserved to ensure and promote recreational pursuits, whether they be hunting, fishing, hiking, bird watching, camping, geocaching, the Sunday Drive, etc. It is the

~~public's land, paid for by the public for the recreational, physical, and spiritual benefit of the public.~~ Those in power must always consider the original purpose of the land first and foremost. If those pursuits can be maintained, or even enhanced, then the land has been preserved even if it is being "used" for other purposes. It's a delicate balance for sure, and I believe there is room for debate on how to handle that balance. But I wholeheartedly reject the two extremes, the all or none doctrine that you seem to be stuck on.