
Letter to the Editor

Dear Sir,

Believing with Wittgenstein that “everything that can be said can be said clearly,” I was dismayed by the chunk of verbiage printed under the “Letter to the Editor” heading in your last issue. I examined it for “abstract reasoning concerning quantity or number.”¹ None. I looked for “experimental reasoning concerning matter of fact or existence.”¹ None. I did not “consign it then to the flames”¹—I want to keep intact my complete set of *Irish Forestry* (any offers?)—but instead I read it again, and again. I do not know what it means; in fact I am driven to the conclusion that it has no meaning.

I have consulted with the writer of the editorial referred to,¹ and with my former colleague Wood Kerne, and they cannot understand the letter either. In the circumstances it is not possible to offer any direct comment in reply.

What Mr. MacOscair, and others, need to realise is that the “taste” (i.e. the aggregate of fashionable attitudes) of this or any age or society has no absolute validity, and indeed may be culpably at odds with the material needs of the age or society. And it is no use referring to “beauty” when we try to define the nature and scope of our objectives. More precision is needed.

Yours Sincerely,
Your Former Editor

1. *Irish Forestry*, 33, (2), 1976, p. 79.