

Default Question Block

Please enter your name in the box below. Your participation in this process will be known only to me (Chelsea Batavia) and my advisor (Michael P. Nelson). All responses will be kept confidential according to IRB protocol, and your identity will not be reported in my thesis, at my defense, or in any publications that may come out of this work. I am keeping track of individual responses only so that I can contact you for clarification purposes.

According to the rules of logic, arguments are constructed out of premises (P) and conclusions (C). By laying out the premises and conclusion(s) of an argument, the line of reasoning behind it becomes transparent, facilitating examination and critical evaluation.

Over the past two months I have been formulating arguments for and against the implementation of ecological forestry on the O&C lands in western Oregon. I would now like to ask for your feedback on my work. In this questionnaire I have sent you three arguments for review. Some of them will support the use of ecological forestry on O&C lands, and some will oppose the use of ecological forestry on O&C lands. I will ask you to assess each argument by answering a series of questions. To be clear, my hope in this exercise is to receive your feedback about whether these arguments accurately reflect debates in the public media and scholarly literature. Although you may not agree with some of the premises or conclusions that you read, please try to evaluate each argument objectively, based not on whether you personally agree or disagree, but rather on whether my formulation of the argument lays out the line of reasoning as you have seen or heard it advanced.

Below is my formulation of an argument in favor of using ecological forestry (EF) on O&C lands:

The “increased timber production” argument

P1: Prior to the NWFP many rural Oregon communities had a timber-based economy.

P2: It is wrong to deprive communities of their economic base.

C1: Therefore, depriving rural Oregon communities of their timber-based economy by limiting harvest on federal lands was wrong.

P3: The wrong of depriving rural communities of a timber-based economy can only be made right by

restoring a timber-based economy.

P4: We can restore a timber-based economy to rural Oregon communities by increasing timber production on O&C lands.

P5: We ought to right past wrongs whenever we can.

C2: Therefore, we ought to increase timber production on O&C lands in order to restore a timber-based economy to rural Oregon communities.

P6: Managing the O&C lands with ecological forestry will increase timber production to a level that will restore a timber-based economy to rural Oregon communities.

C3: The O&C lands should be managed using ecological forestry.

Do you believe that I have accurately represented this argument? (If you think there are some adjustments to be made, but the overall line of reasoning is more or less correct, please answer "yes." You will still have the opportunity to make revisions later. If you think that the argument is generally misrepresented, please answer "no.")

☐ Yes

☐ No

For reference, here again is the argument under consideration:

The "increased timber production" argument

P1: Prior to the NWFP many rural Oregon communities had a timber-based economy.

P2: It is wrong to deprive communities of their economic base.

C1: Therefore, depriving rural Oregon communities of their timber-based economy by limiting harvest on federal lands was wrong.

P3: The wrong of depriving rural communities of a timber-based economy can only be made right by restoring a timber-based economy.

P4: We can restore a timber-based economy to rural Oregon communities by increasing timber production on O&C lands.

P5: We ought to right past wrongs whenever we can.

C2: Therefore, we ought to increase timber production on O&C lands in order to restore a timber-based economy to rural Oregon communities.

P6: Managing the O&C lands with ecological forestry will increase timber production to a level that will restore a timber-based economy to rural Oregon communities.

C3: The O&C lands should be managed using ecological forestry.

Please describe how I have mischaracterized this argument in the box below. Feel free to make suggestions, or even lay out a basic sketch of how you think the argument should be formulated as a series of premises (P) leading to a conclusion (C).

For reference, here again is the argument under consideration:

The “increased timber production” argument

P1: Prior to the NWFP many rural Oregon communities had a timber-based economy.

P2: It is wrong to deprive communities of their economic base.

C1: Therefore, depriving rural Oregon communities of their timber-based economy by limiting harvest on federal lands was wrong.

P3: The wrong of depriving rural communities of a timber-based economy can only be made right by restoring a timber-based economy.

P4: We can restore a timber-based economy to rural Oregon communities by increasing timber production on O&C lands.

P5: We ought to right past wrongs whenever we can.

C2: Therefore, we ought to increase timber production on O&C lands in order to restore a timber-based economy to rural Oregon communities.

P6: Managing the O&C lands with ecological forestry will increase timber production to a level that will restore a timber-based economy to rural Oregon communities.

C3: The O&C lands should be managed using ecological forestry.

Would any part(s) of this argument be better represented with different wording? Please make suggestions in the boxes below.

P1

P2

C1

P3	<input type="text"/>
P4	<input type="text"/>
P5	<input type="text"/>
C2	<input type="text"/>
P6	<input type="text"/>
C3	<input type="text"/>

Now I would like you to assess the premises. First, please describe whether and/or to what extent you think each premise is true. Please consider each premise individually, both as I formulated it and as you may have revised it above. (If you did not revise a given premise, simply leave that box blank.)

P1	<input type="text"/>
P1 (revised)	<input type="text"/>
P2	<input type="text"/>
P2 (revised)	<input type="text"/>
P3	<input type="text"/>
P3 (revised)	<input type="text"/>
P4	<input type="text"/>
P4 (revised)	<input type="text"/>
P5	<input type="text"/>
P5 (revised)	<input type="text"/>
P6	<input type="text"/>
P6 (revised)	<input type="text"/>

Now please describe whether and/or to what extent you think each premise is controversial.

P1	<input type="text"/>
	<input type="text"/>

P1 (revised)

P2

P2 (revised)

P3

P3 (revised)

P4

P4 (revised)

P5

P5 (revised)

P6

P6 (revised)

Do you have any additional feedback about this argument? Please use the box below for comments.

Block 1

Below is my formulation of an argument opposed to using ecological forestry (EF) on O&C lands:

The “enough early seral” argument

P1: Early seral conditions created by roads and clearcuts on private lands are equivalent to early seral conditions that would be created using variable retention harvesting (VRH) under an EF approach.

P2: There is neither need nor desire for an increased abundance of the sorts of early seral conditions created by roads, clearcuts, and VRH on federal forests in the PNW.

P3: We should not increase the supply of what is not needed or desired in greater abundance than is already present.

C1: Therefore, forests should not be managed in a way that increases the abundance of early seral conditions in the PNW.

P4: Using an EF approach, federal forests would be managed to increase the abundance of early seral conditions in the PNW.

C2: Therefore, federal forests in the PNW should not be managed using EF.

Do you believe that I have accurately represented this argument? (If you think there are some adjustments to be made, but the argument is more or less correct, please answer "yes." You will still have the opportunity to make revisions later. If you think that the argument is generally misrepresented, please answer "no.")

☐ Yes

☐ No

For reference, here again is the argument under consideration:

The "enough early seral" argument

P1: Early seral conditions created by roads and clearcuts on private lands are equivalent to early seral conditions that would be created using variable retention harvesting (VRH) under an EF approach.

P2: There is neither need nor desire for an increased abundance of the sorts of early seral conditions created by roads, clearcuts, and VRH on federal forests in the PNW.

P3: We should not increase the supply of what is not needed or desired in greater abundance than is already present.

C1: Therefore, forests should not be managed in a way that increases the abundance of early seral conditions in the PNW.

P4: Under an EF approach, federal forests would be managed to increase the abundance of early seral conditions in the PNW.

C2: Therefore, federal forests in the PNW should not be managed using EF.

Please describe how I have mischaracterized this argument in the box below. Feel free to make suggestions, or even lay out a basic sketch of how you think the argument should be formulated as a series of premises (P) leading to a conclusion (C).

For reference, here again is the argument under consideration:

The “enough early seral” argument

P1: Early seral conditions created by roads and clearcuts on private lands are equivalent to early seral conditions that would be created using variable retention harvesting (VRH) under an EF approach.

P2: There is neither need nor desire for an increased abundance of the sorts of early seral conditions created by roads, clearcuts, and VRH on federal forests in the PNW.

P3: We should not increase the supply of what is not needed or desired in greater abundance than is already present.

C1: Therefore, forests should not be managed in a way that increases the abundance of early seral conditions in the PNW.

P4: Under an EF approach, federal forests would be managed to increase the abundance of early seral conditions in the PNW.

C2: Therefore, federal forests in the PNW should not be managed using EF.

Would any part(s) of this argument be better represented with different wording? Please make suggestions in the boxes below.

P1

P2

P3

C1

P4

C2

Now I would like you to assess the premises. First, please describe whether and/or to what extent you think each premise is true. Please consider each premise individually, both as I formulated it and as

you may have revised it above. (If you did not revise a given premise, simply leave that box blank.)

P1

P1(revised)

P2

P2 (revised)

P3

P3 (revised)

P4

P4 (revised)

Now please describe whether and/or to what extent you think each premise is controversial.

P1

P1 (revised)

P2

P2 (revised)

P3

P3 (revised)

P4

P4 (revised)

Do you have any additional feedback about this argument? Please use the box below for comments.

Below is my formulation of another argument opposed to using ecological forestry (EF) on O&C lands:

The "variable retention harvest (VRH) is a euphemism" argument

P1: VRH is a cornerstone of EF.

P2: The effects and appearance of VRH are not appreciably different from those of a clearcut.

P3: Clearcutting on federal lands in the PNW is socially unacceptable and morally unjustifiable.

P4: Management practices on public lands should not be socially unacceptable or morally unjustifiable.

C: Therefore, federal forests should not be managed using EF.

Do you believe that I have accurately represented this argument? (If you think there are some adjustments to be made, but the argument is more or less correct, please answer "yes." You will still have the opportunity to make revisions later. If you think that the argument is generally misrepresented, please answer "no.")

☐ Yes

☐ No

For reference, here again is the argument under consideration:

The "variable retention harvest (VRH) is a euphemism" argument

P1: VRH is a cornerstone of EF.

P2: The effects and appearance of VRH are not appreciably different from those of a clearcut.

P3: Clearcutting on federal lands in the PNW is socially unacceptable and morally unjustifiable.

P4: Management practices on public lands should not be socially unacceptable or morally unjustifiable.

C: Therefore, federal forests should not be managed using EF.

Please describe how I have mischaracterized this argument in the box below. Feel free to make suggestions, or even lay out a basic sketch of how you think the argument should be formulated as a series of premises (P) leading to a conclusion (C).

For reference, here again is the argument under consideration:

The “variable retention harvest (VRH) is a euphemism” argument

P1: VRH is a cornerstone of EF.

P2: The effects and appearance of VRH are not appreciably different from those of a clearcut.

P3: Clearcutting on federal lands in the PNW is socially unacceptable and morally unjustifiable.

P4: Management practices on public lands should not be socially unacceptable or morally unjustifiable.

C: Therefore, federal forests should not be managed using EF.

Would any part(s) of this argument be better represented with different wording? Please make suggestions in the boxes below.

P1

P2

P3

P4

C

Now I would like you to assess the premises. First, please describe whether and/or to what extent you think each premise is true. Please consider each premise individually, both as I formulated it and as you may have revised it above. (If you did not revise a given premise, simply leave that box blank.)

P1

P1 (revised)

P2

P2 (revised)

P3	<input type="text"/>
P3 (revised)	<input type="text"/>
P4	<input type="text"/>
P4 (revised)	<input type="text"/>

Now please describe whether and/or to what extent you think each premise is controversial.

P1	<input type="text"/>
P1 (revised)	<input type="text"/>
P2	<input type="text"/>
P2(revised)	<input type="text"/>
P3	<input type="text"/>
P3 (revised)	<input type="text"/>
P4	<input type="text"/>
P4 (revised)	<input type="text"/>

Do you have any additional feedback about this argument? Please use the box below for comments.

Block 2