

The visit culminates back at the Centre's display hall. Exhibits and displays feature key prairie wildlife stories. Resource materials are available to explain virtually any question the visitor might care to pose. Herbarium specimens are available for identification of species that were seen outside. Bird tapes allow visitors to identify songs they have heard or wish to hear, while texts and guides provide detailed information on everything from flowers to the physiology of ground squirrels in hibernation.

In all parts of the program, both inside and outside, there are interpreters, most of whom are biology students, ready to answer questions, provide information, and encourage the public to visit other spots of particular interest on the prairies. This personal contact of each visitor is an important part

of our program. One well-answered inquiry usually turns into a discussion of some aspect of grassland ecology that opens the door to a better understanding of the land and its wildlife.

To help enhance the visitor's drive after leaving the Centre, take away literature is available, as are field guides and natural history specialty books to encourage an interest in outdoor pursuits.

Visitors take away from the Centre an enriched experience of their prairie travels. We hope that they take, as well, an appreciation for the complex and fragile nature of a vital ecosystem. With this new understanding their continued prairie travel is more meaningful than the stretches of uninterrupted arrow-straight asphalt had led them to believe. ●

Professional Performance and Attainment of Range Management Goals

William F. Schroeder

We are accustomed to hear people refer to themselves as professionals;—football players, prize fighters, and all the rest. The intended distinction is from an amateur, and is offered in terms of there being a material reward for effort. However, making a living from what one does is not what distinguishes a professional. If you think of the word *profession* in the same field as *profess* and *professor*, you will sense what a *profession* is. Its ancient root means "to avow before." The essential ingredient is a public avowing with the purpose of creating an audience reaction and conversion to a special point of view. In a contemporary scene, it is the equivalent of what we dramatized as the agonized "Statement" that erupts in a profound expression of principle of "where I stand" or "what is my space" or "where I am coming from." You are a professional only if you are prepared to make a public avowing or statement in what you do, and if what you do is continuously consistent with that statement.

I do not intend to reexamine what your statement is supposed to be, but I do presume to suggest how you must function within the current of relevant events if the statement of your professional life is to be understood and be effective. John Dewey (1922) said in his *Human Nature and Conduct* that,

Intelligence is concerned with foreseeing the future so that action may have order and direction. It is also concerned with principles and criteria of judgment.

So let us first review the current of relevant events and

attempt to discover something about the future. When we know the course of this flowing river, we can decide how we should travel it.

What is it which is the subject of your profession? To say that it is "land" does not help us very much in understanding how we are to function with respect to it. To acquire that understanding we must first ingest a simple declaration of political fact. Dr. Gene Wunderlich, an economist with the Agriculture Department's Economic Research Service said it best. He said, "Land is a means for distributing and exercising power."

Peter Meyer (1979), in his *Land Rush, A Survey of America's Land*, said this:

Curiously, in the United States the link between control of the land and its resources and political and economic power has rarely been seen as an organizing theme in decisions about either the use and abuse of the land or the people dependent on it. Unlike the literature about the problems of nonindustrialized nations, with its talk of "land reform" "redistribution of wealth", "green revolution", and "absentee landlords", the debate in the U.S. is imbued with such phrases as "land use", "conservation of resources", "stopping urban sprawl", and "protecting the environment!"

I previously tried to develop this link in respect to the Western rangelands, and we now comment upon what that link portends.

A study of existing land ownership patterns shows approximately 2.3 billion land surface acres in the United States. About 1 billion acres of this is owned by federal, state and county governments or are Indian trust lands held by the federal government. This leaves about 1.3 billion acres, or about 55%, of privately owned land, controlled as follows: about 26.3 million acres, or 2

Mr. Schroeder is a practicing lawyer and has had an office and home in Vale, Oregon, for over 30 years. His law practice deals, to a large extent, with conflicts and disputes involving use of public lands.

This article is based on a keynote address Schroeder gave in the townhall session "Role of People in Rangeland Ecosystems" at the 1980 SRM annual meeting, San Diego, California.

percent, are residential and owned or controlled by 50 million entities; 40 million acres, or 3%, are commercial, non-farm, or waste and are owned or controlled by three million entities; 1.2 billion acres or 95% are ranch, farm, and forest land and are owned or controlled by 7.5 million entities. Even if each entity is an individual, then only 3% of the population owns or controls 95% of the private land and 55% of all American land, government and private. The point I'm trying to make is that so few own so much of the land surface of America.

The Economist points out that about 6% of all farms account for over half of total farm receipts "and the farm labor force is sure to contract further as the bigger farms continue to absorb smaller ones." This concentration of control has resulted from the economics of scale and the price of land in the mechanical/chemical revolution in which farm people have dwindled to less than 4% of the American population.

The fact that this power is now, and tends to continue in, the hands of a few permits attacks upon allodial titles. On October 28, 1979, the Secretary of the Interior called specific attention to what he regarded as the superior value of "publicly owned land versus private land." Almost ten years ago John Fischer (1970) wrote that,

My final apostasy from the American Creed was loss of faith in private property. I am now persuaded that there no longer is such a thing as truly private property, at least in land.

The concept of the allodium—land owned independently without rent or payment in service, the *freehold*—was the tenure deliberately adopted by this nation. The alternative, the feudal or King-owned system, was the concept which was deliberately rejected. Notwithstanding, this has been the "decade of quiet federalization" of controls over the land. The governmental planning and control of the use of private land is the most fundamental social reversal of our times. American society may be becoming less concerned about preserving the concept of private property or, at least, less solicitous of the bundle of rights with which the concept of private property is involved.

What has this to do with "Managing the Public Rangelands" beyond the fact that the administration of such a vast domain has a profound impact on the use of directly associated private lands? A statement under that name was issued in November 1980 by the Bureau of Land Management. Eighteen percent of the beef calves produced in the U.S. in 1979 was produced in these States and it is presumed that this production was largely dependent upon the public rangeland. The public rangeland is a significant beef nursery and such a shift of this nursery to the private lands will increase the cost of livestock.

Since it takes about seven times as much acreage to produce protein through livestock than to produce protein in crop products, the cost of animal protein is thus more sensitive to the cost of the land upon which it is produced. Recently, the Department of Agriculture announced that in the year ending November 1, 1979, the value of farm real estate jumped another 16%. Since 1970 the value has gone up by about 200%. Most of the largest gains were in the West and Delta States. Increasing the dependency of livestock production upon private land, which is becoming more expensive, would suggest an increase in the consumer cost of animal protein. However, such a consumer cost increase will probably not be

tolerated for long and political pressures will again trend toward a greater exposure to foreign supply. This is more probable given the growing indifference which American society seems to have toward the historical sanctity of private property. From this one would expect a lessening interest in paying cost increases necessary to help sustain the traditional American concept of private property. An unwillingness on the part of American society to support the higher costs of livestock protein will certainly result in a fundamental change in the livestock operations dependent upon the Western rangelands. This change will be toward the consolidation of the private lands involved to obtain access to the number of acres of public land required to sustain an economic operation by entities whose investment objectives are as important or more important than production profit objectives. The change will accelerate when the livestock grazing allowed upon the public rangelands is significantly reduced and consolidation occurs so as to sustain an economically feasible livestock operation. This consolidation will be primarily with a land investment motivation. This trend has been occurring and will intensify as the management of the public rangelands becomes more intense.

This is almost certainly the course of the river. Since we know that it is the course, let's see how best to travel it.

First a word about what we cannot do. We cannot manage the public *rangelands*. We are able only to manage their *use*. We know the competition for that use; we evaluate it within the statutory guidelines and, in the end, try to manage the ensuing conflict. Phil Ogden from the University of Arizona perceived the real problem as being allocation.

However, Frank Gregg, Director of the Bureau of Land Management, says,

We take seriously our charge from Congress, the President and the courts to restore the nation's rangelands. And we will do it.

This is the same call made by Henry Wallace in his monumental report more than 40 years ago. The rehabilitation of the public rangelands is a conventional wisdom morally required in the manifest destiny of the United States. The Congress has now accepted the responsibility in its Public Rangeland Improvement Act.

However, the argument which has always been difficult to resolve morally is the one of allocation. The resource professional should be very careful about his involvement with this problem because its solution is within the social or political, instead of the resource expertise. It is very well for the professional to recognize the multiple uses; it is quite another thing to prioritize them, as an allocation necessarily does.

There has not been any social and political guidance upon this subject except that, somehow, the priorities are to be discovered within the land use planning process. This supposes that the inventorying and the subsequent processes will produce an automatic consensus among the competitors as to how the resource is to be allocated. The resource professional must know instead that there will not be an evolutionary allocation decision, and he or she better know that he or she's not the one to be the social and political determiner of the priorities. Resolving this conflict is neither within their field nor experience and they had better leave that decision to someone else.

The Bureau of Land Management policy proposal, *Managing the Public Rangelands*, says that:

Distribution of the benefits of current and increased production is achieved through the allocation of vegetation among competing uses. Decisions about the allocation of these resources are made after the present condition, potential productivity, and trend of the vegetation (improved, static, or declining) has been measured. Then priority in the allocation of the vegetation will be given to...

It then suggests that the maintenance and improvement of the resource will be given first consideration. Then will be considered the protection of threatened or endangered species and their habitat followed by all of the other consumptive and nonconsumptive uses in one mixed bag. That writer either saw the allocation problem and deferred it for a later resolution, or he saw the wisdom of avoiding it as not being within the expertise of the professional public rangeland manager.

Some conclusions respecting allocation will evolve in the land use planning process; but these conclusions will be the obvious set-asides. A unique geologic feature may be generally accepted as deserving of protection for nonconsumption and other such phenomena may dictate obvious allocation. However on the whole, the competing users will not agree upon what the allocation should be any more than they ever did, and the public rangeland manager should be very cautious about his either resolving or arbitrating this social and political choice.

This is especially true in the context of an intensifying consolidation of the ownership of land. If "Land is a means for distributing and exercising power", as Dr. Wunderlich says, the intensifying consolidation of this power will say something about what the allocation is to be and whether the physical, rather than the social sciences are to make it at a given level. More to the immediate point is the fact that if the professional rangeland manager permits himself to make this choice, his ultimate objective of maintaining and improving the public rangelands will suffer. Nothing so impairs the credibility of a profession and its objectives as extending the profession beyond its expertise and its capacity. The song of Sancho Panza is relevant. It makes no difference whether the pot hits the rock or the rock hits the pot, the result will go hard for the pot.

This leads me to the second point about running this river. Although it is the *use* you manage, it is your obligation to manage that use in terms of the maintenance and improvement of the resource, and not in terms of who is to exercise that use. If this point is obvious to you, then you are not an agency resource manager.

It has been a frequently reoccurring experience over a long period that an agency resource manager will make the most profound decision in significant consideration of who is making the use. One example: recently I spent some days on review of an administrative decision which changed the allowable season of livestock grazing use. The decision-makers told the Administrative Law Judge that the decision was based, to a significant degree, on consideration of the fact the preference owner had recently acquired the base property. What has this to do with the decision? The rationale was that the allowable season of use might be later changed in the land use planning process and the livestock operator should suffer a present instead of a future shock which might be more

acute after he had developed his livestock operation upon the existing season of use which, incidentally, continued to apply to almost all of his neighbors.

A resource manager should know, of course, *how* a use is to be made, but he should not care who makes it so long as the one who does has permission to do so. If a resource manager allows his decision-making process to become involved with aspects which are unrelated to the resource, he is beyond his expertise, his function and his right.

This is essential in the intensifying consolidation of the ownership of natural resources. Land use planning must be fashioned upon the use of the land instead of upon the one who uses it simply because that one will almost certainly change. The resource manager is not a dispenser of public largesse; he is not a feudal lord who gives what he knows or what he believes he knows is best for his constituents or community. He is there to administer the Congressional policies within a regulatory framework to the extent his expertise permits. This is his entire function; nothing more.

I have suggested that you do not permit yourselves to be extended beyond your area of expertise. As professionals you should object to any statutory, regulatory, or directory implications that you should do so and you should resist the seduction of this power.

Secondly, I have suggested that you restrain yourselves from managing natural resources in consideration of anything beyond your statutory objectives and you should resist the seduction of this power. Finally, I suggest that you should resist the seduction of any power.

Unquestionably, the executive agencies have power. It is evidenced dramatically by the fact that in 1978 the Federal Register used about 61,000 pages to record their rulemaking activities. In the past decade seven new regulatory statutes were passed. The television series entitled *A Study of the American Presidency* speaks to the overwhelming complexity of executive government and the power which it enjoys.

The exercise of this power is expensive because of the cost of exercising it and because of the cost to those upon whom the exercise is laid. It is estimated that the cost private enterprise paid to comply with federal regulations exceeded \$100 billion in 1979. *The Rulemaking Improvements Act of 1979* was introduced to require agencies to evaluate the benefits, costs, and adverse impact of a proposed rule before it is promulgated. Such a study will augment the existing cost, and so it goes. The cost is incomprehensible, but it is not the cost of this power to which I would like to address these closing comments.

Too many agency resource managers have been seduced by their power and have expressed it in a variety of ways. Some express it overtly and thereupon become instant failures. Others justify their decisions upon their own authority and dry-lab support only after the decision has been made and the decision is entering the crucible of the courtroom. It is this history which inspired an intelligent and responsible citizen from the State of Idaho, Bill Swan, to say, "The BLM already has decided what has to be done to manage rangeland—that the number of livestock must be reduced and facts will be found to justify that decision." He and others have seen the power to cut and run and hesitate to accept the invitation of the BLM Director to "Start working together to improve the

Western public lands."

In the beginning we discussed the fact that essential to your profession is an avowal, a Statement. The objective of your profession is to have that avowal and that Statement shared. In 1972, the distinguished Club of Rome in its publication, *The Limits of Growth* said,

We are convinced that realization of the quantitative restraints of the world environment and of the tragic consequences of an overshoot is essential to the initiation of new forms of thinking that will lead to a fundamental revision of human behavior and, by implication, of the entire fabric of present day society.

This is broader than what you may conceive the avowal of your profession to be, but is similar in scope. A Statement of the Professional position is of revolutionary

significance and it must be tenderly developed if it is to be reasonably accepted. Even the appearance of power will defeat it. The axiom of John Viscount Morely, is true today. "You have not converted a man because you silenced him." Real power is understated, if it is expressed at all. Even a momentary forgetting of this professional principle entirely destroys the impact of your avowing, especially where such an important Statement is to be made and broadcasted and prayed for.

I hope that your profession, range management, which intends to maintain, nurture and improve natural resources will not be diverted by seductions of power or sterilized by the consequences of having permitted that to happen.

Bismarck-Mandan

Through The Annals Of Time

Clair Michels

Exec. Vice President, NDSA

Although comparatively young in the annals of time, the Bismarck-Mandan area has a rich and romantic historical background.

The area was first claimed by the Indians, then by Spain, then France and finally the United States.

Four periods of history are represented, namely: (1) exploration and fur trading, (2) Indian frontier, (3) military occupation, and (4) settlement.

First recorded appearance of the white man in this immediate area dates to 1738 when Pierre de LaVerendrye, a French-Canadian fur trader and explorer from Quebec ven-

tured through in search of a river passage to the Pacific. He came only to the east side of the Missouri River near Apple Creek just south of present Bismarck.

The area seems to have been pretty much forgotten for the next 60 years, or until the 1790's when a few intrepid fur trappers began coming up the Missouri from St. Louis (founded by the French in 1764).

Shortly after the Louisiana Purchase President Jefferson commissioned the Lewis and Clark Expedition which camped on the west side of the Missouri River, near what is now Fort Lincoln State Park, on October 20, 1804. Their journals report having visited the ruins of the Slant Indian Village that day and were told by an old chief the village was

This article is reprinted with permission from the *North Dakota Stockman*, June, 1980. Photos are from the State Historical Society of North Dakota.



The Main street of Bismarck in Dakota Territory in 1873.