Decreasers, Increasers, and Invaders equaling 100 percent. To do otherwise fails to recognize differences in percentages by individual species that occur in the climax or during degeneration and subseres in types of sites that are mappable in rangeland inventory.

The similarity in species composition, on ranges in the Excellent Range Condition Class for a specific type of site, even though they returned to that Class from a great array of vegetation types in the lower condition classes, is indeed remarkable. Then too, as Clements said "All seres converge toward the climax." This undoubtedly explains why some have assigned percentages to individual climax dominants. But, as an Odum textbook put it, ". . . species are to some extent replaceable in time and space so that similar communities may have different species compositions."

5) The use of interpretive soil groups for range mapping units—instead of taxonomic or topographic mapping units—though a part of the method and now the standard for the USDA Soil Conservation Service in at least six states, has not been mandated nationally for the SCS. None the less, such soil group names developed under SCS leadership were adopted as standard by the USDI, Bureau of Indian Affairs in 1958 for reservation rangelands in all western states and by the province of Alberta, Canada, for all of its rangelands in 1966 with reaffirmation in 1972. Moreover, mapping units of the method have been reported by the USDA, ARS as correlated both with water intake rates (Tech. Bull. 1390, 1968), and watershed runoff (Jour. Soil & Water Conservation, 1981).

They are also used elsewhere; but, in many Soil and Water Conservation Districts the older topographic site names have been retained and continue to be used. Therefore, it should be understood that these do not conform with the method under consideration because topographic sites such as Stony Ridge, Bottomland, North Exposure etc. can differ greatly in soil depths, textures, etc., with resulting differences in potential natural vegetation (climax)—the point from which Range Condition Class is measured. ●

Viewpoint: A Rare Look at "R.A.R.E"

Stu Bengson

What is "R.A.R.E."? R.A.R.E. is an acronym for "Roadless Area Review and Evaluation"! In other words a "study" or "inventory" of the "roadless" areas in the National Forest System that may have wilderness characteristics and evaluate the suitability of these areas for inclusion in the National Wilderness Preservation System. Sounds quite simple and straight forward. At least that's what the U.S. Forest Service thought back in February of 1971 when they first started the whole thing (RARE I). Now, almost 15 years later, the USFS and the public are still embroiled in a legal/political battle over what is or isn't wilderness." What's even worse is that, while all this bickering goes on, other resources of the National Forests are being neglected because the precious time of the overworked professionals of the Forest Service and critically short budget dollars are being spent trying to resolve the conflicts.

Why are we in this bitter turmoil? Basically I believe it's due to the jealous and selfish attitudes and perceptions of a small minority of users of the National Forest resources. Under the concepts of "Multiple-Use," the National Forests are used to derive the greatest benefits for the greatest number of people. No one user of the resources should monopolize the lands or resources for its own benefit. The National Forests were created to benefit the public as a whole and "Multiple-Use" doctrines were established to achieve these goals. What is happening is that extremely influential minority groups are demanding singular use of the National Forest lands for their own exclusive benefit. Some environmental extremist groups would have all N.F. lands "wilderness." On the other hand zealously ambitious resource developers want absolutely no "wilderness" and all N.F. lands to be "developed." The majority of Americans want something in between. Some "wilderness" is good, but we also need the resources of the N.F. lands for our growing needs. Multiple-Use of the N.F. lands could supply both needs. The pious, self-serving, attitude of either extreme has no place in this critical issue. The question of "wilderness" should focus on the facts alone. Let's look at some "FACTS."

Back in 1964 when Congress first enacted the Wilderness Act some 9.1 million acres of National Forest Multiple-Use lands were permanently designated as Wilderness (approx. 5% of the National Forest System). An additional 5.5 million acres were classified as "primitive areas" until such time as the Forest Service could accurately determine if these areas were indeed suitable for "wilderness." Then in June 1970 the USFS decided to administratively expand these prospective "wilderness" areas and inventory all "roadless" areas in the NFS. In 1971 the first inventory of "roadless" areas became known as R.A.R.E. I and identified some 274 areas encompassing more than 12.4 million acres. By July of 1972 this inventory had grown to 1,448 areas totaling more than 56 million acres (30% of the NFS). When this information was publicized the environmental community immediately filed a lawsuit claiming that the inventory was inadequate. In June of 1977 the USFS began R.A.R.E. II, or the second study of "roadless" areas. R.A.R.E. II inventoried 2,919 areas totaling over 62 million acres. On January 4, 1979, the Forest Service issued its final reccommendations for RARE II. More than 15 million acres (an additional 8% of the NFS Multiple-Use lands) should be designated "wilderness,"bringing the total to more than 24 million acres or about 13% of the NFS. An additional 11 million acres would be held for "further study"

The author is Director of Land-Use United Four-wheel Drive Associations.

to possibly include in the NWPS later. This more than doubles the amount of acres that was originally agreed to by all parties involved with the original Wilderness Act of 1964 (everyone at that time agreed to a national total of 15 million acres). After RARE II hit the public another lawsuit was brought on the grounds of inadequacy. Ultimately the U.S. Forest Service lost its case when the 9th Circuit Court of Appeals decided in October of 1982 in favor of the environmental groups who were suing the USFS, and in essence ordered "RARE III".

Where are we today? To avoid the costs and grief of doing a "RARE III" the U.S. Forest Service preferred to allow Congress to settle the disputes and enact Wilderness Acts for each State. These designated Wilderness Areas would then become part of the Management Plan of each National Forest. Today we have some 55 million acres of Wilderness and Further Planning Areas (some 30% of the Multiple-Use lands) in the National Forest System and it's still growing. Although many States' Wilderness Acts have passed, many other State Wilderness Acts are still embroiled in controversy. Also, the language of the Acts leaves a window of opportunity big enough to turn a loaded log truck around in and we could have more "wilderness" added in just 10 short years or less.

How much "wilderness" is enough? If you add the 55+ million acres of National Forest Wilderness to some 35 million acres of National Park Service Wilderness and another 20 million acres of Fish & Wildlife Service Wilderness you have over 110 million acres of Wilderness in America today. Add this to the potential 30 million acres of BLM "Wilderness Study Areas" and the total jumps to 140 million acres of "wilderness." This is in addition to the other 23 million acres of Wildlife Refuges and 33 million acres of National Parks which are managed just the same as "wilderness." In total then it can be said that 196 million acres of America's "public" lands are "wilderness" (that's almost 1/3 of the "public" lands).

This has all got to end. Our lands and natural resources need to be managed for Multiple-Use not "preserved." Today we are losing some 1.4 million acres of productive agricultural land each year to urban sprawl. We lose 4 billion tons of topsoil and 20% of our shoreline each year to erosion. Another 1.7 million acres of prime wildlife habitat is destroyed each year. With our growing population and affluence we need *all* our lands to meet increasing demands. We *can* manage and conserve our land and resources to meet these demands through Multiple-Use Management. We can have the necessities of life as well as "wilderness" (they've been doing it in Germany for centuries). However, we *cannot* continually "preserve" millions of acres for the exclusive use of an elite minority. Nor can we afford to allow unprincipled developers to ruin vast acres. Let's let professionally trained and technically expert land and resource managers take care of the land instead of having self-serving politicians dictate how our "public" lands shall be managed and our precious natural resources used.

References

USDI Bureau of Land Management, *"Public Land Statistics,"* 1980.
USDA Yearbook of Agriculture, *"Using Our Natural Resources,"* 1983.
Bureau of Land Management, *"Facts,"* 1984.
Thomas C. Nelson, *"Preservation vs. Multiple-Use on the Federal lands"*, Dec. 30, 1983, American Mining Congress.
CAST (Council for Agricultural Science & Technology), *"Multiple-Use of Public Lands in the 17 Western States"*, Rep. #45, 7/11/75.

Associate Editorship—*Journal of Range Management*

Nominees are being sought for 2 associate editorships which will be open in the coming year. Associate editors serve for 2 years with an optional 2-year renewal. Areas of expertise especially needed at present are plant physiology, reclamation and range improvements, sampling methodology in range research, and soils. Candidates selected will work with an associate editor for 3 months before taking over complete responsiblity in February 1986.

Nominees should have a strong and current background in research, be capable writers, and have had successful experience as reviewers. Associate editors are responsible for conducting the review of manuscripts and for accepting or rejecting manuscripts. The average yearly load is 20-30 manuscripts.

Nominations should be submitted before 15 September 1985, to the Editor, *Journal of Range Management,* 2760 West Fifth Avenue, Denver, CO 80204. The individual making the nomination should give his own name, the name, address, telephone number, and current position of the nominee as well as a description of his qualifications for the associate editorship. The nominator should ascertain that the individual would be willing to serve if selected. An Editorial Replacement Committee will select the associate editors subject to the approval of the Board of Directors.

The Society's journal both reflects the state of the professionand influences the course of the profession. Selection as an associate editor is, therefore, an honor and a responsiblity.