around portions of the landscape and label these delineations rangelands. Lands falling outside these lines must be considered secondary by the range man and primary responsibility for their management relegated to others such as foresters and agronomists.

Certainly the "professional" range man cannot and should not attempt to be all things to all people. However, the "professional range man" by experience and training should have some attributes that qualify him to make land use and management decisions on broader segments of the landscape than are apparently allocated to him under Dr. Dyksterhuis' philosophy. It seems to me that among other things (watershed, wildlife, recreation, etc.) the range man must be concerned with management that will provide a year around forage supply for grazing animals, domestic or wild. If this is true, the range man must use his talents to manipulate factors at his disposal to integrate land resources, or products of land resources, to provide this year around forage supply. Failure to be concerned with the year around forage supply greatly restricts the scope for the real range manager.

Are rangelands merely a station on an assembly line occupied by a "range man" who fits one piece onto the product, as it moves by, and who never sees or is not concerned with that which comes off the end of the line as a finished product? To be effective, the range man must have the expertise to provide superior service at his station on the assembly line. In addition, the "professional" range man must have the training and vision to see how all parts of the landscape fit together and function as a whole.

Far be it for me to detract from the importance of the agronomist or the forester. They have expertise in areas which certainly are not the primary concern of the range man. I for one am pleased that there are many foresters and agronomists in the ASRM and hope the association is mutually beneficial. My point, however, is that President Dyksterhuis seems to be greatly restricting the value of the range man in land management and relegateing some of his just responsibility to others no more or maybe less qualified. In my opinion, the one thing that may tend to set the "range man" apart is his orientation or tendency to concern himself with the whole "system."

The "professional" range manager must have a degree of competence that uniquely qualifies him in matters concerning rangeland. However, it must be recognized that all members of the ASRM are not, and according to the founding fathers, need not be range men. Membership in the ASRM (despite feelings to the contrary) does not necessarily carry a connotation of professionalism. I just don't know what amount of cultural practices or the size of unit that changes the range to a cultivated or some other kind of pasture. I don't know the number of trees per acre it takes to make a forest. The extreme ends of the scales are easy to identify and thus categorize responsibility. The wide gray area in the middle is not so easily categorized. Contrary to President Dyksterhuis' statement, I believe there are large segments of the landscape with trees on the horizon or lands seeded to forage grasses that are not best "specified" by foresters or agronomists. Professional range men must include the management of these lands in their repertoire. Of course, a mark of any professional is to be discriminating and to know the limits of his competency. On the other hand, it seems to me there is a point beyond which one cannot pull back or restrict himself and still be considered a professional.

Toward the end of his letter, Dyke states: "Our goals are, . . . . " Are these really "our goals?" If so, they appear to severely restrict the scope and effectiveness of the professional range manager. If followed closely, the range man will soon be restricted to that part of the landscape that in fact "has little or no use for other primary purposes."

It would appear that the philosophy expressed by President Dyksterhuis is not consistent with that of long standing objectives of the ASRM. Dyke's apparent position seems to severely restrict the scope of the range manager. However, the ASRM is open to all "who are interested in grazing land management or grazing livestock problems."

The ASRM cannot be all things to all people, but it does tend (right or wrong) to be an "umbrella" society that accommodates a wide divergence of people and ideas. So long as the ASRM embraces these broad concepts, its "goals" must also remain broad.

With all due respect, President Dyksterhuis as a range man may set goals as restrictive or as broad as he sees fit. However, goals or restrictions as advanced by any individual need not limit the scope and effectiveness of the ASRM.-Dillard H. Gates, Oregon State University, Corvallis.

Role of Animals in Resource Management--A Unique Contribution of the Range Scientist?

It's an understatement to say that our Society is currently struggling with problems of professional development! However, we have been more successful in strengthening our academic requirements than in identifying the uniqueness of a range scientist. When forced to pinpoint what a range man does that is different from anyone else, we inevitably stumble and mumble around over physiology, ecology, etc. until we finally settle on management. Why we are so bashful to admit that management is important, I wouldn't know unless it connotes more art and less science. For purpose of the present discussion, our objective is to answer an important and timely question--what is unique about a range scientist?

Management of the forage crop on rangelands has been traditionally the domain of range people. However, in recent years many of our productive natural resource scientists have received advanced training in a specialized field such as botany, animal nutrition, and economics. These workers have contributed understanding important in managing the range forage crop and it is not surprising that we have come to regard forage management, per se, as less important. Paradoxically, we have stressed basic understanding and unconscious given ground in a field where our expertise is the strongest. The question is "how
can we regain and maintain a stronger hand in the management area?” Perhaps by stressing the ability of range people, based on their broad background in training and multiple-use philosophy, to use animals as a tool in resource management we can become more effective land managers. My espousing of this point of view for nearly a year now has generally met with favorable response except for one authority in the field who regards this as the province of wildlife management. If wildlife managers were all of the range manager’s scope of activities. I am even more troubled when, within our own discipline, we build a fence (as Dr. Hedrick does) around one phase of range management and try to stay within it. In addition to being knowledgeable about the role of domestic livestock and wildlife in altering natural environments, we need to be knowledgeable about, and actively involved in, other aspects of the management of range lands such as (but not limited to) watershed (with its attendant problems of water production and pollution), recreation, conservation, natural beauty and “people problems.” Range management, like forestry, came into being as a protector of our natural resources. Range management was cast in the heroic role of the savior or preserver of our natural resources, not a manager of resources. Much of the vitality of range management stemmed from being identified with the conservation crusade. Most range positions are still identified as “range conservationist” positions. However, we now tend to be closely tied to animal production in the domestic livestock industry. The public doesn’t regard livestock production in the same light as it did protection. The public we are dealing with is more urban oriented than the public we dealt with in the days of the great conservation crusade. The public today is worried about natural beauty, stream pollution, and the price of food. They have little direct concern for the costs of livestock production (California Cattlemen’s Assoc. “Hot Irons” June 3, 1968), the plight of the livestock operator or the lack of professionalism in range management. To quote Charles Connaughton (J. Forestry 65(12):876. 1967), our problem is that we are not “in tune with the times.” The blame for lack of professional status is not the fault of the public. The blame can be placed squarely on the shoulders of range management for not keeping current in our ideas.

Until we realize that range management includes a broad cross section of resource and “people” problems, we do not stand to advance in professional stature. To quote Steve Spurr (J. Forestry, 66(1):26. 1968) “what sets the professional apart in our field is his overall education and training which hopefully give him a broad base of knowledge upon which to build his practice, and an understanding of creative processes that permits him to tackle new problems that constantly beset him.” It is not the ability to use the animal that sets range management apart. If this were the case, there would be no difference between a professional range manager and technicians and sub-professionals or husbandmen.

What sets the range manager apart is the particular set of “concepts” which, taken together, are the essential content of range management (Bentley,