Anyone who has visited an old growth forest or stand understands the beauty they possess. They humble me in person or even in photographs. Which is why I get very angry when I come across articles about clear cuts of trees that are thousands of years old and then used for trivial uses, such as phone books and magazines. I read an article from Greenpeace that was about clear cutting of Cedars, Spruces, and Hemlocks from Canada’s, Victoria Island. The British Columbian government then proceeded to export these trees to other countries for manufacturing. The reasons I disagree with these actions are numerous.

First, I do support the timber industry. If I were to claim otherwise I would be a bigger hypocrite than I already am when it comes to resource usage. I like paper. I like to read and write on it, and enjoy many of its other uses. I like wood. I am glad that I live in a sturdy house and can enjoy sitting on furniture. However, I would never cut down a tree that is centuries old to produce any of these luxuries. We have the technology and resources to develop a sustainable forest management plan. This, to the best of my knowledge, is sustainable even though our usage is very high. Trees are renewable resources as we all know. If we replant a cut tree, a productive species can re-grow for harvest in about a half century.

For these reasons and the beauty of an old growth forest, I believe it is wrong to use such trees for industry. And anyone who does not stand to receive economic benefits would surely agree. I admire trees for sequestering carbon dioxide, nutrient storage and cycling, and their other beneficial ecological functions. But if the timber industry can avoid clear cuts, soil erosion and old growth cutting, we really can have an efficient, and sustainable natural resource.