



NATURAL RESOURCES JOURNAL

Volume 42
Issue 2 *Spring 2002*

Spring 2002

Front Matter

Natural Resources Journal

Recommended Citation

Natural Resources Journal, *Front Matter*, 42 Nat. Resources J. vii (2002).
Available at: <https://digitalrepository.unm.edu/nrj/vol42/iss2/1>

This Front Matter is brought to you for free and open access by the Law Journals at UNM Digital Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Natural Resources Journal by an authorized editor of UNM Digital Repository. For more information, please contact amywinter@unm.edu, lsloane@salud.unm.edu, sahrk@unm.edu.

INTRODUCTION

Since its beginning more than forty years ago, the *Natural Resources Journal* has prided itself on its multi-disciplinary interests. Philosophy, politics and economics, the "P, P and E" of England's great universities, always stood side-by-side with law, the primary focus of the UNM School of Law.

Continuing in that long tradition, this issue of the *Journal* brings together the work of philosophers Max Oeschlaeger and Scott Davidson, complementing each other in their discussion of wilderness; the work of political scientists Robert Poirier and David Ostergren, comparing the treatment of indigenous peoples by three different national park systems; the work of environmental studies Ph.D. candidates Ryan Danby and Ruth Langridge, one working an area spanning Canada and the United States to explore coordinated management of shared protected areas, the other following the history of water regulation in a particular area to show how water management, fragmented over time, has created the flexibility needed to introduce and incorporate changing values.

But no article so captures the multi-disciplinary possibilities of inter-disciplinary natural resources work as Michael Soules's article on the controversial 1994 Northwest Forest Plan. The plan provided a political solution to the stalemate that seemingly irreconcilable resource conflicts had brought to land use planning in the Northwest's national forests. Somehow the plan balanced the incompatible claims of trees, old-growth forests, endangered species, recreation, timber companies, and timber-dependent communities. It did so in the haze of thousands of land use allocations for a vast and rich area of forest service lands and in the cacophony of contradictory claims for the resource values served by those allocations.

Soules began his graduate career as a city planner on the west coast at Berkeley and as a lawyer on the east coast at Yale. But what he brought to the Northwest Forest Plan, in an effort to analyze what the Plan had done, were the tools of a high-level statistician. Using complex multiple regression analysis, Soules isolated the relative importance of ecological, economic, political and other variables on the Plan's land use allocations. As you will see, the results were astonishing and, as often happens when science comes to politics, show that what people said was different from what they did.

From the *Journal's* point of view, however, what was even more astonishing was the number of disciplines and perspectives and issues of central natural resource concern combined in Soules's article. In it you have, among other things, statistical analysis of all critical competing resource values in the complex decisions as to how to manage the Northwest's national forests. Somehow the Clinton Administration balanced the competing claims and Soules finally shows us how in an article that itself masterfully balances many resource interests and many analytic techniques.