

groups want a forest, but residents envision the forest as a multi-use commons in a plural economy, while the foresters envision a managed natural resource in a commercial timber industry.

With time, the two visions will converge somewhat. The lag-time effect described earlier will weaken as resident understanding of the current management plans increases. The "timber supply" agenda of the provincial forestry will evolve toward one emphasizing multiple use and better resident input to management plans.

More management and more regulations—of both domestic and commercial forest users—seem inevitable. We make two suggestions to improve the dialogue between residents and foresters as they adapt to the changes. The first is to alter the public participation format, and the second is to assist foresters in public relations. Experiments in public participation in forest management are now underway in western Newfoundland (O'Keefe 1996; Bath 1995; Freeman 1994; see also Roddan 1994). Led by trained conveners, these experiments bring foresters, firewood cutters, loggers, plant operators, community leaders and environmentalists together to identify the crucial decisions needed, examine their differences, review the evidence, and arrive at wide-ranging policy recommendations. This form of public involvement is frustrating and slow, but it offers more opportunity to introduce alternate goals, examine why people think the way they do, and empower all participants.

Our second suggestion is to give foresters in the field greater support and training in public relations, as the *20 Year Forestry Development Plan* proposes. Like the shared management experiments mentioned above, the intent of improved public relations is to expand public understanding of current forestry practices, to exchange reliable data, and to open dialogue about alternative visions of the forest. What we have written here is offered as a briefing paper to enrich that dialogue by laying out for study the residents' alarms, the foresters' responses, the key differences in values and information between them, and the broader historical and cultural context which colors their visions.