



ISTF NEWS

5400 Grosvenor Lane

Bethesda, Maryland 20814, USA

Special Report, September 2011

Planted Forests in the Neotropics */

J. L. Whitmore

ABSTRACT

As long as the demand for wood products is not reduced, these will more and more have to be produced in forest plantations. There are groups that oppose the idea of tree-planting. Sooner or later these groups, which feel they want to protect nature and natural forests, will need to support the idea of forest tree plantation in order to attain their goals. It is not necessary to destroy a healthy and diverse natural forest in order to put in its place a forest plantation. There are many sites in most countries where plantations can be established without removing forest to do so. Without silvicultural plantations, a great shortage of wood shall likely result. Until recently, the worldwide harvest of wood has been from three main sources: 1) primary forest, 2) secondary forest, and 3) plantations. Each of these sources was producing about a third of the global harvest, but the plantations portion has been increasing. In Latin America there has been a strong tendency to use exotic species in forest plantations, largely with great success. There has been progress in research to analyze the favorable and unfavorable conditions for successful introduction of an exotic species. Our ability to predict beforehand the probability of problems has improved with models that distinguish whether a species offers low, medium or high risk of invading a site if we introduce it as an exotic.

The International Society of Tropical Foresters is a non-profit organization formed in the 1950s in response to a world wide concern for the fate of tropical and subtropical forests, ISTF is dedicated to providing a communications network for tropical forestry disciplines.

ISTF WebSite: www.istf-bethesda.org

Board of Directors

President & Director-at-Large, Gary Harshorn	Regional Director for Meso & South America, Carlos L. Sandi
Vice President & Director-at-Large, Roger R. B. Leakey	Teija Reyes, Director-at-Large
Regional Director for Africa, Cornell O. Dudley	Vitor Afonso Hoeflich, Director-at-Large
Regional Director for Asia & the Pacific, Patrick B. Durst	

Staff

Frank H. Wadsworth, Editor; Jennifer F. Adams, Staff Editor;
Patricia Heaton Holmgren, Office Manager; Alicia Bazán Jimenez, Spanish Translator;
Jacob L. Whitmore, Associate Director

*/Updated version of: The Social and Environmental Importance of Forest Plantations. J. L. Whitmore. 2007. Proceedings, International Union of Forest Research Organizations (IUFRO), 6.06.00. April 18-21, 2007. Arlington, Virginia USA. pp. 109-115.

INTRODUCTION

In Latin America and elsewhere there are various subjects of great importance in the field of forestry. These include the matter of plantations, which is no more, nor less, important than the others. Forest plantations constitute an integral part of ecosystem management. In this paper I will emphasize plantations (as opposed to native forests), mainly in Latin America. Included will be the environmental and social aspects, with the economic considered as part of the latter.

Until the demand for wood products is reduced, we will have to depend more and more on forest plantations. This is true for two reasons: a) with an increasing worldwide population, there is an increasing demand while at the same time the quantity and quality of the forests is decreasing; and b) there is an increasing tendency worldwide to utilize the forest for its non-wood benefits, resulting in an enormous pressure to not harvest trees in native forests.

This pressure is not new and to a certain point it is easy to understand. There are important reasons for protecting a portion of the native forests in each country and using the other portion for the production of wood-related benefits, at least in countries blessed by an adequate amount of forest resources. But the controversy begins in reaching agreement on the definition of “adequate” and in determining how large the portions should be.

Those who reject the harvesting of trees in native forests claim that, without this harvesting, the forests will be saved. Unfortunately, in the majority of countries the harvesting of trees is not the main reason for the destruction of forests. There are other major problems that influence the destruction of forests in Latin America, Asia, Africa and other continents that have nothing to do with tree harvesting. These include poverty, which leads to the well-known and traditional “felling and burning”, and the conversion of forests for cattle ranches or for other reasons. These two factors constitute the main reason for deforestation in countries of the third world, although tree harvest is the main cause in a few countries.

Sooner or later, the persons who oppose plantations with the idea of preserving nature and natural forests will have to support forest tree plantations. Protecting natural areas and their germplasm is an excellent goal, but achieving this will depend on the productivity of plantations in order to satisfy human needs such as wood, paper and renewable construction materials. It is simply impossible to preserve all the forests or even half of them. But it is possible to manage them in a controlled and sustainable manner by utilizing intensive silviculture techniques for plantations where there are no longer healthy forests; extensive silviculture techniques in areas declared as forests for sustainable production based on natural regeneration; and techniques for the protection of natural areas where there are species in danger of extinction or to preserve examples of ecosystems and their germplasm.

These days we know how to manage our forests. However, many forests are being exploited without the benefit of silvicultural methods designed to maintain the productivity and sustainability of the site (Whitmore 1992). It is also important to emphasize that it is not necessary to destroy a healthy and diverse natural forest in order to put in its place a forest plantation. There are many sites in most countries where plantations can be established without removing the original forest. Every year we see more sites like this due to deforestation (Bowyer 1998; Sedjo and Botkin 1997). The successful case of Jari in the Brazilian Amazon is an exception that does not have to be repeated (McNabb et al. 1994). In the case of a native forest that exists on soils truly appropriate for agriculture in a country with a shortage of food, it is

assumed that there will be a justification for converting it to agricultural use, but these days it is rare to find soils of this quality under a forest. Of course, in a country such as Guyana or a region such as the State of Amazonas in Brazil, where there are many forests and few people, there is currently little need to establish forest plantations (Franco 1997).

The only hope for forests is good management (Gómez-Pompa and Bainbridge 1995). The conservation of forests implies rational long-term use, and requires sustainable forest management, normally for various purposes, one of which will be predominant. For example, a forest near a city is a critical area for the production of water and this would be the primary use. But perhaps the site is also used as a home for wildlife and for the limited harvesting of wood and non-wood products. It will possibly be used for limited recreation as well.

But there are political forces that prefer preservation to conservation, insisting that there is little place in sustainable management for the harvesting of wood products. This controversy is not new; it is more than one hundred years old. The well-known United States forester Aldo Leopold (1949) wrote the following ideas (paraphrased) on this subject:

We foresters consist of two groups. Group A considers land as soil with the principal function of production. Group B considers the land as a biota with a broader function. The question is how broad is that function, and that is where the doubt and confusion begin.

Group A is content to produce trees as if they were agricultural produce, with cellulose as the basic product. Its ideology is agronomic. On the other hand, group B considers the practice of forestry as different than agronomy since it manages species and natural environments instead of artificial ones. This group prefers natural regeneration. They are concerned, for biotic and economic reasons, with the losses of species such as the American chestnut. They are also concerned about a range of functions of secondary forests, e.g. wildlife, recreation, drainage basins and wild areas. All of this implies the beginnings of ecological awareness.

At the same time as Leopold, an ecologist at the Pan American Union warned us about the “agronomic ideology”, with several examples in Latin America (Vogt 1948). More than 80 years before Leopold and Vogt, George Perkins Marsh wrote about the subject (Marsh 1864). And, at the same time as Marsh, President Tomás Cipriano de Mosquera of Colombia approved a forest law to protect Colombian forests (Castrillón Arboleda 1994).

What does all of this have to do with forest plantations? It seems to me that Leopold’s group A is right provided some of the forests are managed as natural sites without changing them. And it seems to me that group B is right in the sense that without any control all the forests in the world are in danger, which harms all of us. It also seems to me that the two groups have to cooperate to resolve the matter and that plantations could be, and will have to be, the common ground between them. It is quite certain that in this century there will be a scarcity of food without agronomists. Also, without the silviculturists’ plantations it is very probable that there will be a great scarcity of wood, and many more forests ruined by over-exploitation. Although techniques exist for managing native forests sustainably, many continue to be exploited without using these techniques, and plantations can alleviate this problem.

THE PURPOSES OF FOREST PLANTATIONS

Evans (1992) states there is no scarcity of wood in the world and thus asks why there is so much emphasis on planting forest trees? Obviously, there is a scarcity in some regions and an excess in others. However, Evans's analysis indicates various possible purposes for forest plantations. His ideas on purposes, and those of others, are summarized below.

1. To correct a lack of resource caused by deforestation. Previously certain countries had many forests but are now left with very little. They are trying to supplement their needs with tree plantations.
2. The need for pulp and paper products. Utilizing sophisticated techniques, the annual per hectare yield in plantations is frequently very high (Bowyer 1998). In addition, the option of installing plantations costs more than natural regeneration (see, for example, Tables 1A and 1B), which requires high yields for these products.
3. An increase in the demand for high-quality products. Plantations of teak, mahogany, Spanish cedar and other fine species have the purpose of satisfying part of this demand (Sedjo and Botkin 1997).
4. The need to export. Some countries have the opportunity to develop a forest-products export industry and sometimes this industry is based principally on forest plantations. Chile and New Zealand are two of the best examples.
5. Domestic uses. In some countries almost all of the wood that is harvested is used for firewood, posts and home fences. Some populations suffer from an acute scarcity of wood and it is here that the forest plantation can have a very positive and beneficial effect for the community and for the country.
6. Degraded sites. Forest plantations, sometimes jointly with agricultural crops, can restore a site that has been ruined by a previous inappropriate use (Haufe 1981, Parrotta 1992).
7. The danger of gene extinction. The forest species most used for plantations are very valuable. Stands of superior trees should be protected for the seeds they provide. But sometimes these stands are in danger, for example from the invasion of agriculture. In such a case, it is appropriate to conserve its genes *ex situ*, in plantations far removed from danger (Gallegos et al. 1981).
8. Lack of access. Even in countries that have forests in large quantity, problems can occur if the forest is not accessible. In cases like this, it may be that the plantations established on those marginal sites with no higher use can solve two problems: the lack of accessible products and the lack of use of previously unproductive sites.
9. Lack of success in natural regeneration. In forests that are managed on the basis of natural regeneration, this regeneration sometimes fails to become established. In some cases, especially where the cost of manpower is not very high, an enrichment plantation can be established to renew the forest.
10. Little population per unit of land area. In some countries there is much underutilized, unforested land, such as the llanos of Venezuela, for example. Planting forest trees in such areas can be of great use for future production and can protect the land from erosion. Even in heavily populated countries, such as China for example, plantations can be established on very degraded sites, can improve such sites for

future uses that are more intensive (Parrotta 1992; Parrotta et al. 1997b; Lugo 1997; Lugo and Liegel 1987) and at the same time protect watersheds (Burley, Turnbull and Whitmore 1992, 1994).

11. Advantages of forest plantations:

Plantations can produce wood ten or even up to twenty times more rapidly than the native forest under optimal conditions (Bowyer 1998), although some estimates are lower than this (Sedjo and Botkin 1997).

Normally they consist of a single species (although there are many examples of success with mixed plantation [Smith et al. 1997; Wormald 1992]) that provides a source of uniform wood that is easy to process and sell.

A plantation uses the site to the maximum from the commercial point of view, compared to a natural forest, which utilizes it to the maximum from the viewpoint of biodiversity. The former maximizes the profit, with more risk, and the second minimizes the risk, usually with less profit.

The cost of harvesting per cubic meter of wood is minimized with plantations.

Spacing, thinning and rotation factors can be easily manipulated in plantations.

Genetic improvements can be applied in plantations in order to select against insects, diseases or defects, or in favor of shape, speed of growth, density of the wood or other factors.

Plantations in tropical zones have the advantage of growing continually for twelve months a year where water is not a limiting factor.

12. Non-traditional purposes:

The traditional purpose of planting forest trees is to produce wood for local use and/or export. However, plantations can serve other purposes as well, together with or apart from the goal of wood production.

As Lugo (1997) has indicated, various purposes can be assigned to plantations: to maximize the production of benefits such as wood, or for restoration objectives, protection against erosion, etc.

Rural development is another purpose. A plantation project may generate jobs, create resources where there were none before, improve the quality and quantity of the water produced in a watershed, utilize low-value land, help create infrastructure in underdeveloped zones and supplement agricultural efforts through agricultural, silvicultural and grazing methods (agroforestry).

Plantations can provide firewood, forage, shade and home construction materials. Recently, the Chevron and Weyerhaeuser Corporations have formed a joint venture aimed at the production of biofuels, called Catchlight Energy LLC (www.catchlightenergy.com).

In order to support agriculture, plantations are used as windbreaks and protection of water sources for irrigation.

There are uses for improvement of urban sites as well. The majority of the citizens of many countries live in urban areas. Planting of trees can improve the quality of life. Urban shade is a very important “forest” product (Schubert 1979).

Plantations may improve the biodiversity of a site previously ruined by agriculture, animal grazing or cutting of the forest.

In the Kyoto Agreement (1997), the industrialized countries that contribute to most of the world's pollution proposed to finance action plans in tropical countries in order to capture the carbon produced by industry. Called "carbon offset", it is a very controversial idea. However, at present thousands of hectares of plantations are being established in tropical areas, for example in Costa Rica, under similar programs for the purpose of capturing or offsetting in one country the carbon produced in another.

A large degree of the variation in the purposes of forest plantations is due to the various goals among owners of forestland and among political groups interested in the forest resource. Other variation may be due to the many species and ecosystems involved. Despite so much variation, the future of plantations points to a large increase in the rate they are established during the next several years.

WOODY AGRICULTURE OR SUSTAINABLE FOREST?

At present, the world wood harvest comes from three principal sources: 1) the primary forest (e.g. Canada, Russia, the Amazon, Indonesia and Malaysia), 2) the secondary forest (e.g. the United States, Canada, Russia and Europe) and 3) plantations (e.g. Scandinavia, the southeastern United States, Japan, China and India with regard to indigenous species, and Brazil, Chile, Venezuela, Uruguay, Argentina, New Zealand, Australia, South Africa, Indonesia, Thailand and the Iberian Peninsula with regard to exotic species). Each of these three sources has been producing approximately one-third of the overall harvest (Table 2). However, the proportion produced in plantations is increasing (Sedjo and Botkin 1997).

In the debate over exotic versus indigenous species, it is argued that exotics are always better than indigenous species, or that exotics should never be used, or that the truth falls between these two extremes. In Latin America there has existed a very strong tendency to use exotic species in plantations, for the most part with great success. There have been problems with plantations of indigenous species, for example with mahogany and Spanish cedar (Whitmore 1976 a & b). But for the last 30 years research on the use of indigenous species in forest plantations has been rather successful, especially in tropical areas. There are now good options that compete with exotic species (Espinoza and Butterfield 1989; Russo and Sandi 1995; Prebble and Leigh 1997).

There has been a lack of silvicultural information on native species. For the high Andean zone there is now good data on 40 native species that have been abused for centuries (Loján Idrobo 1992). But more study is needed on how to manage them in plantations. These species are adapted to high altitudes where very few exotic species can grow. The zone is an agricultural area with human populations that depend greatly on the wood resource, up to the point of having destroyed it in many cases. Planting of some of these species could substantially alleviate the pressure on the little resource that is left, and enhance the quality of life for many people.

But perhaps we need to analyze what we mean by "indigenous species". For example, let's say that *Swietenia macrophylla*, or Honduras mahogany, existed for thousands of years on a certain hill in Costa Rica until the year 1966 (a hypothetical case). In 1966, a rancher felled the entire forest on this hill in order to pasture his cattle there. For seven years it was highly overused by the cattle, with a load double

what it could support. The rancher went bankrupt and the hill was very degraded. The new owner of the hill tried to plant mahogany on the site, recalling that there was a mahogany forest there before. But the plantation failed!

The question is: should or should not the mahogany be considered indigenous to this site under these conditions? Possibly what was indigenous before may not be so any more. Possibly, in order to restore a site that has been degraded in this way more drastic measures are required. For example, it may be necessary to plant a species that never before existed on this site but that has earned a reputation for facilitating recovery of degraded sites (Parrotta 1992; Parrotta et al. 1997a, 1997b; Lugo 1997, Brown and Lugo 1994).

Concerning monocultures, Ewel (1991), an ecologist, analyzed the issue and recommended to his colleagues that they take a “balanced” attitude, i.e., to not automatically reject a project only because it involves use of monoculture. Others have also studied the question of forest monocultures (Popovich 1980, for example). The principal points they make include the following:

Whether for grapes, bananas, pine, teak, eucalyptus or other products, much land has been devoted to commercial crops for socioeconomic purposes through the use of monocultures and frequently exotic species. This can be justified, even if many times these activities utilize the best land.

There are large differences between forest monocultures and agricultural monocultures. For example, forest species monocultures usually use several genotypes instead of just one (Popovich 1980), and these often are wild, rather than domesticated genotypes. Genetic diversity has not been bred out.

Considering the hundreds of thousands of square kilometers that are planted in monocultures every year, it is surprising there are not more problems with diseases and insects (Ewel 1991). Obviously a plantation using intimate mixtures or small mixed blocks will have more protection against these problems. In the case of a forest species with its complete and original genetic complement (which is the case with the majority of them), this species may resist any attack compared to an agricultural species or a highly modified forest species, such as certain eucalyptus clones for example.

In cases where a native forest has been felled in order to establish these activities, a diverse forest has been changed into a very “simplified” ecosystem, which involves advantages and disadvantages. Generally, this practice should be avoided.

Imitating the structure and function of natural communities in our agricultural (and silvicultural) systems may be desirable ecologically, but involves serious management problems (Ewel 1991).

Without employing monocultures and exotic species, we would have to use many more hundreds of thousands of square kilometers of native forest to satisfy human needs. For this reason it may be that monocultures are justified even if the price we pay — the biodiversity of some sites — is high (Ewel 1991).

The purpose of using exotic species varies in each case, but it normally includes many of the advantages mentioned earlier (Table 3). The main danger in using an exotic species is the possibility that it will adapt to the site with such success that it turns into a weed. An exotic species can begin reproducing uncontrollably and do great damage to the indigenous flora under certain conditions. There are a number

of examples, including *Melaleuca quinquenervia* in Florida, *Leucaena leucocephala* in the Virgin Islands, *Ailanthus altissima* in the eastern United States and various species introduced into the Hawaiian Islands. How to define these conditions has always been a challenge and remains so. We have sometimes depended on “luck” and the result, in addition to the damage to the ecosystem, has been political pressure against the introduction of exotics.

Recently there has been progress in the analysis of suitable and unsuitable conditions for the successful introduction of an exotic species. Our capability of predicting in advance the probability of problems has been considerably improved with the use of models prepared at the University of Washington which help determine if a species offers a low, medium or high risk of invading the site when introduced as an exotic (Reichard and Hamilton 1997).

There are various levels of intensity in forest planting. One very low intensity level is the practice of enrichment. When regeneration has failed in a secondary forest, it is sometimes possible to improve the composition of the forest by planting seedlings of desirable species among the secondary vegetation. This requires much manpower in order to cut strips or lines in the forest perhaps 2-3 meters wide with 5, 10 or 15 meters between lines. It also requires quite a bit of cleaning during the early years to avoid having weeds dominate the plantation (Smith et al. 1997). There are various examples of success, such as mahogany in the Caribbean National Forest in Puerto Rico, a mixture of five species (including mahogany) in the Tapajos National Forest south of Santarem, Brazil, and in Surinam with Spanish cedar and other species.

Agrosilviculture in its various forms represents another intensity level. The use of trees planted among crops or on grazing land has a variety of purposes and methods and is described in dozens of publications, including Denevan et al. 1987; Valdivia and Cueto 1979; Vega Condori 1987; Wadsworth 1997; Hartshorn and Whitmore 1998; and Smith et al. 1997.

The planting of forest trees sometimes requires many years to achieve a harvestable product. During this time, the landowner will want to receive some profit from the land before the tree rotation is completed (Smith et al. 1997). Agrosilviculture is a method for achieving this and is an attractive method, not only for the farmer. Large industries sometimes use agrosilviculture to receive income from the land during the first few years after trees are planted. An example in Chile has been the El Tollo farm near Quirihue (Whitmore and Burwell 1986).

At the higher level of intensity, plantations can have the characteristics of “woody agriculture” rather than silviculture. Some use agricultural land, pesticides, fertilizers and perhaps irrigation. The rotation lasts longer than one year and the plant that is harvested normally (but not always) measures ten meters or more in height, which distinguishes this practice from agricultural crops. In the future, we will see much more use of “woody agriculture” to satisfy the world’s need for fiber.

This could result in a more sustainable native forest if it reduces the need to harvest such forest intensively. But how sustainable will intensive plantations be? The answer depends perhaps on each person’s point of view. Those who compare it with a native forest will remain dissatisfied. Those who recognize the need to produce fiber on land that has little biodiversity, and is unproductive, in order to protect the native forests may justify intensive planting. Those that compare it with activities that are truly agricultural and intensive, such as sugar cane and rice, will have to declare that it is a more sustainable

and less damaging system than many alternatives. The Forest Stewardship Council (FSC) recognizes that plantations can serve an important, and sustainable, role, under conditions which are described in their "Principle 10" (FSC 1996).

Using already proven silvicultural techniques (fallow land, crop rotation, fertilizers etc.) based on ecological science, we can produce intensive forest plantations on any given site, probably forever. And plantations that use longer rotations of some 10-30 years, for example, can promote or improve the biodiversity of a degraded site (Lamb 1997).

CONCLUSIONS

The forests have always been heavily used by human beings. They provide us with food, construction materials and other resources and benefits. They also play a very important role in the health of the biosphere since they affect the atmosphere, erosion, the hydrological cycle, the carbon cycle and other biochemical cycles (Sedjo and Botkin 1997). Plantations provide us with many of these same benefits, but not all of them. A well planned plantation can provide us with many more benefits than one planned for a single purpose.

Some suggest that almost all of the wood we need could be produced on intensive plantations, requiring very little land, less than 10% of the planet's surface (Sedjo and Botkin 1997). Possibly they are right about this estimate. However, if the primary or secondary purpose of this plan is to prevent any harvesting in native forests, it is doubtful that plantations can satisfy that objective. Conservation does not mean "don't touch", except in certain protected natural areas. In such cases, preservation is the proper term.

Undoubtedly, a massive program of intensive plantations using marginal unforested areas, could supply a large part of the wood we need, along with other benefits as well, including reducing the pressure on the native forest. But for centuries we have seen in many parts of the world that forests are going to provide tangible benefits or they are going to disappear. The tendency is to convert a forest that is seen as unproductive into a site that is productive in human terms, even if it is a plot of corn that produces no yield after three years. A combination of intensive plantations, extensively managed native forests, and special areas protected for their biodiversity is the model most probable to succeed as we manage our landscapes and ecosystems.

If we accept the idea of intensive and massive plantation, it would be much easier to accept the idea of more extensive protected areas: perhaps a goal of 30% of the native forest instead of 10% or less. However, the factor of the poverty of a community near the protected forest can often make the protection of the forest difficult or impossible. It is no accident that the tropical world has lost 20% of its forests during the years 1960-1990 (Sedjo and Botkin 1997).

There is much social resistance to the idea of intensive plantations. Some are concerned that plantations could first require felling the native forests (Smith et al. 1997). Given that the native forest gives us important benefits that plantations do not offer and given that there is much underutilized land that does not have forests, it should not be necessary to fell a healthy forest in order to find a good site for plantations. It certainly does occur and therefore the concern is a valid one. However, it would be more productive to promote well planned plantations rather than oppose all planting of forest trees.

What will the role of plantations be for the rest of the 21st century? I assume and believe the following. Forest plantations will be the source of 40-50% of the fiber harvested during the 21st century, and perhaps more than 50%. They will have a key importance, both environmental and socioeconomic. They will serve to improve degraded sites, to protect natural areas and watersheds, to produce paper pulp and other wood products, as a critical habitat for certain wildlife species, for recreation purposes, as a source of biofuels (more than in the past), and for other uses. They will have to be established and managed using environmentally and economically suitable techniques. They will have to use pesticides and fertilizers in acceptable ways. It is probable that 30-60% of them will use carefully selected exotic species. Biotechnology and other advances will bring us very productive plantations, some yielding more than 100 m³/ha/year. Part of the secret of success will be maintaining a broad genetic base, using the advantages of a biodiversity that can help to reduce the risk. Even in the case of clonal plantations, there are techniques that can provide an advantage over agricultural plantations in this sense.

Plantations will be established on marginal sites under strict standards. As Sedjo and Botkin (1997) point out, if these guidelines are not followed, there will be a political reaction against plantations that will be detrimental to society and to the environment. We need to establish plantations in the most professional and responsible manner possible.

As to Mr. Leopold and his groups A and B, perhaps we now need a group C. This group would consist of a new generation of foresters who are able to better integrate socioeconomic and environmental values in their management of the forest resource. This new professional would be capable of applying the wisdom we foresters have accumulated during the last two centuries and managing the resource at the landscape or ecosystem level to the benefit of the individual and the society, without losing the intrinsic values of each forest. It is a large goal, but if we do not attain it, we are going to lose more forests.

LITERATURE CITED

- Bowyer, J. 1998. Viewpoint: TFF Board states position on tree plantations within tropical regions. Tropical Forest Foundation News, February, 1998. Alexandria, Virginia (USA). pp. 1+4.
- Brown, S. and Lugo, A.E. 1994. Rehabilitation of tropical lands: a key to sustaining development. *Restoration Ecology* 2:97-111.
- Burley, J., Turnbull, J. and Whitmore, J. 1992. National afforestation project, China: report of the World Bank International Advisory Panel. 19 p.
- Burley, J., Turnbull, J. and Whitmore, J. 1994. National afforestation project, China: second report of the World Bank International Advisory Panel. 24 p.
- Castrillón Arboleda, D. 1994. Tomás Cipriano de Mosquera: biografía. Planeta Colombiana Editorial, S. A. Bogotá, Colombia. 713 p.
- Denevan, W. M., Padoch, C. and Flores Paitan, S. 1987. Swidden-fallow agroforestry, Iquitos, Peru. In: A.E. Lugo (Editor), *People and the Tropical Rain Forest*. U.S. Man and the Biosphere Program, pp. 8-9.

- Espinoza, M. and Butterfield, R. 1989. Adaptabilidad de 13 especies nativas maderables bajo condiciones de plantación en las tierras bajas húmedas del Atlántico, Costa Rica. In: Salazar, R. (Editor), Manejo y Aprovechamiento de Plantaciones Forestales con Especies de Uso Múltiple. Actas de la Reunión IUFRO (S1.07-09), Antigua, Guatemala, April 1989, pp. 159-172.
- Evans, J. 1992. Plantation Forestry in the Tropics: Tree Planting for Industrial, Social, Environmental and Agroforestry Purposes. Clarendon Press, Oxford UK, 403 pp.
- Evison, D. 2008. The impact of carbon credits on New Zealand Radiata pine forestry probability. NZ Journal of Forestry 53(1):42-44.
- Ewel, J.J. 1991. Diversity: yes, we got some bananas. Conservation Biology, 5: 423-425.
- Franco, W. 1997. Bases estratégicas para el desarrollo sustentable del Estado de Amazonas de Venezuela. Interciencia 22(4):184-193.
- FSC. 1996. Principles and criteria for forest stewardship; as ratified by Forest Stewardship Council members and board of directors, February 1996. <http://www.fccoax.org>
- Gallegos, C., Zobel, B., y Dvorak, W. 1981. Formación de una cooperativa de recursos de coníferas de Centro América y México por los esfuerzos combinados del gobierno, la industria y la universidad. . In: Whitmore, J. L. (ed.) 1981. Producción de madera en los neotrópicos via plantaciones. Actas, IUFRO/MAB/Servicio Forestal (EE-UU) Simposio. IUFRO S1.07-09. Septiembre 1980. Instituto de Dasonomía Forestal. Río Piedras, Puerto Rico. pp. 375 – 381
- Gómez-Pompa, A., and Bainbridge, D.A. 1995. Tropical forestry as if people mattered. In: A.E. Lugo and C. Lowe (Editors), Tropical Forests: Management and Ecology. Springer-Verlag, New York, pp. 408-422.
- Hartshorn, G. S. and Whitmore, J. L. 1998. Anthropogenic disturbance and tropical forestry: implications for sustainable management. In: Ecosystems of Disturbed Ground. L. R. Walker, ed., Elsevier Publ., New York. [in press].
- Haufe, H. 1981. Parámetros conducentes a la definición de prioridades para la rehabilitación agroforestal de laderas degradadas en los neotrópicos. In: Whitmore, J. L. (ed.) 1981. Producción de madera en los neotrópicos via plantaciones. Actas, IUFRO/MAB/Servicio Forestal (EE-UU) Simposio. IUFRO S1.07-09. Septiembre 1980. Instituto de Dasonomía Forestal. Río Piedras, Puerto Rico. pp. 349-355.
- Lamb, D. 1997. Biodiversity restoration by plantation. ITTO Tropical Forestry Update 7(2):3-5.
- Leopold, A. 1949. A Sand County Almanac; with essays on conservation from Round River. Sierra Club/Ballantine Books. New York. 295 p.
- Lojan Idrobo, L. 1992. El verdor de los Andes: árboles y arbustos nativos para el desarrollo forestal altoandino. Proyecto Desarrollo Forestal Participativo en los Andes. Quito, Ecuador. 217 pp.

- Lugo, A. E.. 1997. The apparent paradox of reestablishing species richness on degraded lands with tree monocultures. In: J.A. Parrotta and J. W. Turnbull (Editors). *Catalyzing Native Forest Regeneration on Degraded Tropical Lands*. *Forest Ecology and Management* 99:9-19.
- Lugo, A. E. and Liegel, L. H. 1987. Comparison of plantations and natural forests in Puerto Rico. In: A. E. Lugo, ed., *People and the Tropical Forest*. US Man & the Biosphere Program, Washington, DC. Pp. 41-44.
- Marsh, George Perkins. 1864. *Man and Nature; or, physical geography as modified by human action*. Cambridge. Republished by Harvard University Press. 1965.
- McNabb, K.L., Borges, J. and Welker, J. 1994. Jari at 25: an investment in the Amazon. *Journal of Forestry*, 92: 21-26.
- Parrotta, J. A. 1992. The role of plantation forests in rehabilitating degraded tropical ecosystems. *Agriculture, Ecosystems and Environment*, 41: 115-133.
- Parrotta, J. A., Knowles, O. H. and Wunderle, J. M. 1997a. Development of floristic diversity in 10-year-old restoration forests on a bauxite mined site in Amazonia. In: J. A. Parrotta and J. W. Turnbull (Editors), *Catalyzing Native Forest Regeneration on Degraded Tropical Lands*. *Forest Ecology and Management* 99:21-42..
- Parrotta, J. A., Turnbull, J. W. and Jones, N. 1997b. Catalyzing native forest regeneration on degraded tropical lands. In: J.A. Parrotta and J. W. Turnbull (Editors). *Catalyzing Native Forest Regeneration on Degraded Tropical Lands*. *Forest Ecology and Management* 99:1-7.
- Popovich, L. 1980. Monoculture: a bugaboo revisited. *Journal of Forestry* 78(8):487-489.
- Prebble, C. y Leigh, J. 1997. Putting a model into practice in Peru. *ITTO Tropical Forest Update* 7(3):5-8.
- Reichard, S. y C. Hamilton. 1997. Predicting invasions of woody plants introduced into North America. *Conservation Biology* 11(1):193-203.
- Russo, R. and Sandi, C. L. 1995. Early growth of eight native timber species in the humid tropic region of Costa Rica. *Journal of Sustainable Forest Management*, 3: 81-84.
- Schubert, T. 1979. *Trees for urban use in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands*. Institute for Tropical Forestry, Río Piedras, Puerto Rico. GTR SO-27. 91 p.
- Sedjo, R. A. and Botkin, D. 1997. Using forest plantations to spare National Forests. *Environment* 39 (10):14 -20, 30.
- Smith, D. M., Larson, B.C., Kelty, M.J. and Ashton, P .M. S. 1997. *The Practice of Silviculture: Applied Forest Ecology*, ninth edition. John Wiley & Sons, New York, 537 pp.
- Valdivia, S. and Cueto, L. 1979. Settlement and rural development in the eriazas zones of the north coast of Peru. In: G. De Las Salas (Editor), *Proceedings, Workshop on Agroforestry Systems in Latin America*. Turrialba, Costa Rica. CATIE and UNU. pp. 163-169. 26-30 March 1979.

Vega Condori, L. 1987. Crecimiento de cedro *Cedrela odorata* manejado en fajas de rastrojo y en asocio inicial con cultivos. CONIF INFORMA, No. 10, Bogotá, Colombia, 20 pp.

Vogt, W. 1948. Road to Survival. William Sloan Associates, New York. 335 p.

Wadsworth, F.H. 1997. Forest Production for Tropical America. Agriculture Handbook 710. USDA Forest Service, Washington, D.C. 563 p.

Whitmore, J. L. 1992. Advances in sustainable forest management of natural tropical forest, and in plantation of native species. Proceedings, International Symposium on Harvesting and Silviculture for Sustainable Forestry in the Tropics. Oct. 5-9, 1992. Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia. pp. 1-9.

Whitmore, J. L. (ed.). 1976a. Studies on the shootborer *Hypsipyla grandella* (Zeller) Lep., Pyralidae. Vol II. IICA Misc. Publ. No. 101. Turrialba, Costa Rica. 139 p.

Whitmore, J. L. (ed.). 1976b. Studies on the shootborer *Hypsipyla grandella* (Zeller) Lep., Pyralidae. Vol III. CATIE Misc. Publ. No. 1. (IICA Misc. Publ. No. 101). Turrialba, Costa Rica. 116 p.

Whitmore, J.L. and Burwell, B. 1986. Industrial agroforestry. *Unasylya*, 38: 28-34.

Wormald, T. J. 1992. Mixed and pure forest plantations in the tropics and subtropics. FAO Forestry Paper, 103. FAO, Rome, 152 pp.

Wright, J. 1976. Introduction to Forest Genetics. Academic Press. New York, NY. 463 p.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS OF INTEREST

Ladrach, W. E. 2010. Manejo Práctico de Plantaciones Forestales en el Trópico y Subtrópico. Editorial Tecnológica de Costa Rica. 655 p.

Mann, C. C. 2005. 1491: new revelations of the Americas before Columbus. Random House, New York. 541 p.

Montagnini, F. et al. 2008. Reforestation for control of invasive grass and watershed protection in the Panama Canal. *Revista Forestal YVYRARETA* 15: December 2008.

Schlaepfer, M. A., et al. 2011. The potential conservation value of non-native species. *Conservation Biology* 25(3):428-437.

Victor, D. G. (ed.). 2005. A vision for world forests: results from the Council on Foreign Relations Study. *J. of Sustainable Forestry* 21 (4): 113-135.

Table 1A. Requirements for establishing forest plantations at the industrial level (Ladrach, in Wadsworth 1997).

Public relations	Fertilization
Land acquisition and tenancy	Mapping
Protection of existing natural forests	Maintaining
Planning roads and firebreaks	Selecting species
Determining rotation	Estimating yields
Seed source	Establishing nursery
Site preparation	Spacing and thinning
Planting methods	Fire control
Pest control	Good record keeping
Training the crew	Training the contractors

Table 1B. Principal risks in forest planting (Ladrach, in Wadsworth 1997)

Wildlife	Pests
Mistake in choosing site-suitable species	Quantity and quality of seed
Problems in nursery and planting	Unsatisfactory wood quality
Poorly trained crew	

Table 2. Total industrial wood harvest, by forest type (Sedjo and Borkin 1997).

Type	Harvest (percentage of total)
1. Primary forest	30*
2. Secondary forest, minimum management	14
3. Secondary forest, managed	22
4. Industrial plantations, native	24
5. Industrial plantations, exotic	10
Total	100

1. Includes forests in Canada, Russia, the Amazon, Indonesia and Malaysia

2. Includes forests in parts of the United States, Canada, Russia

3. Includes forests in North America, Europe, Russia

4. Includes plantations in the Nordic Regions, much of Europe, the southern United States, Japan, and parts of China and India

5. Includes plantations in Brazil, Chile, Venezuela, Uruguay, Argentina, New Zealand, Australia, South Africa, Indonesia, Thailand, and the Iberian countries

**The percentages are estimates.*

Table 3. Why exotic species tend to have better yields than native species (Wright 1976, in Wadsworth 1997).

Natural selection favors survival more than economic factors

Environmental changes proceed faster than the evolutionary response

Human-induced changes do not produce an evolutionary response

Evolutionary possibilities are limited by the native flora

Native species may be destroyed by introduced pests

Native species may be sensitive to the shock of planting

The natural distribution of a species may be limited by factors unrelated to its yield.