

WOOD AND FIBER SCIENCE

JOURNAL OF THE SOCIETY OF WOOD SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

VOLUME 18

APRIL 1986

NUMBER 2

EDITORIAL ON EDITORIALS, ETC.

In the October 1985 issue of WOOD AND FIBER SCIENCE, the editorial committee expressed their concern with the poor participation of the membership in writing editorials. The ad hoc vitality committee indicated three areas of concern—membership, image, and public policy. John Haygreen has offered some perceptive remarks about the past, present, and future of SWST and its constituency, which probably shed some light on the problems cited. So, from his last paragraph, I shall go on:

I sense a widening gulf between members (and prospective members) employed by the public vs. the private sector. Efforts to broaden R&D in the public sector, and stated as intended to increase the application of science in industry, may have done the opposite. Industry, *never* an avid fan of self-supported technology, has observed and encouraged more public-supported work for a decade or more. Gradually, an attitude of "Why not let George do it" emerged. As this position grew more prevalent, fewer and fewer industrial colleagues were available to man the communications links with public-paid efforts. Those links served in both directions—helping decide how to integrate the two work centers, sharing ideas on what each should do, as well as what to do with the results. We have lost that balance.

Maybe we now have a situation of one group talking to itself; their private sector counterpart greatly diminished (telephones disconnected, or whatever); and if anyone else overhears the first group's private conversation, they don't speak the language so don't understand why all that noise is worth much.

This is an admittedly biased view from a defrocked industrial product developer, now watching the game from the end zone. Let's hear it from other directions.

JACK H. MARKLEY
Property/Casualty Agent
Troy Insurance Agency
Lewiston, Idaho 83501