state calls exceed my in-state calls on strawberries. I have no problem with this, as other states and their land-grant scientists have helped us immeasurably in the past. It's all part of being a good land-grant scientist and educator.

In closing, I would like to say that it is a joy to have the full force of a research organization behind your extension program. I don't believe that land-grant scientists are trying to duck real-world problems. In fact, I am constantly soliciting their ideas and advice to help us with that very tough-to-make-a-living farming world out there. They (the experts) want to see the North Carolina farmer be more successful, and they truly wish to contribute. It is my job to help channel that flow of expertise into areas where it can do the most good for the strawberry farmer.

One More Perspective on "A Blueberry by Any Other Name..."

James F. Hancock¹ and
Barbara Goulart²

At the risk of starting a chain of letters, we would like to respond to some of the criticisms made by Ehlenfeldt and Vorsa (*HortTechnology* 3:465-466) on our recent article in the Readers' Forum.

First, we appreciate their minor corrections in our table of species compositions. It is indeed more likely that pentaploids contribute genes from the

¹Department of Horticulture, Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI 48824.

²Department of Horticulture, The Pennsylvania State Univ., University Park, PA 16802.

two progenitor species proportionally rather than equally. As they indicate, however, "these corrections do little to alter the total sense of our original table." We were surprised that Ehlenfeldt didn't alert us earlier to our computational errors, since he reviewed a rough draft of our manuscript.

Second, the suggestion that blueberries are similar to cultivated *Brassica* is a bit stretched. Cauliflower, broccoli, brussels sprouts, and cabbage are very different crops and, in most of these, different parts of the plant are eaten. In contrast, all blueberry fruit look the same and originate from the same plant part. Only one species, *Brassica oleracea*, was used in the development of the various cole crops, while the different types of blueberries had distinct origins that are now being blurred through introgression. They are not analogous situations.

Finally, Ehlenfeldt and Vorsa suggest that the proper definition of wild is "...not the product of selective breeding." We suggest that all plants that are cultivated cannot be considered wild, regardless of whether they are naturally seeded or not. One can argue the relative merits of these two definitions *ad nauseam*, but it still seems to us that lowbush plants that are "irrigated, fertilized, mowed, burned, and sprayed" cannot be considered wild with a clear conscience. Certainly, it has not occurred to anyone to call fruit from the highbush cultivar Rubel wild, even though it was a gift from nature and not bred by anyone.

We agree with Ehlenfeldt and Vorsa's contention that "...we should retain descriptors if they are useful," and "rabbiteye" have played an important role and are still "useful," but the day is rapidly approaching when they will lose their utility. Modern breeders are fast blurring the distinctions between the major types of blueberries.