

Number 86-3 and its parents are the first roses of spring to bloom. They are, therefore, subject to damage by late freezes. Such was the case in 1988 when #86-3 produced only a dozen hips. But in the autumn of 1989, as I write this, the three big bushes are loaded with fruit, supporting the rule that the more sterile the F₁ cross, the more self-fertile will be the associated amphidiploid.

Many of the hips now ripening are selfs which I made in the spring. It is my first aim to acquire, and make homozygous, the thornless feature of the *R. banksiae* parent. Meanwhile, though, I could not resist making the cross, #86-3 x Cyt.67, where the pollen parent is a tetraploid form of *R. laevigata* which I obtained with colchicine in 1965. Many hips of this cross are now ripening. *R. laevigata* ('Cherokee Rose') has the distinction of bearing a large and beautiful, pure white flower, always one to a stem. In distinct contrast, *R. banksiae* blooms in many-flowered umbels of small roses.

I must mention one other cross that I made, *R. carolina alba* x #86-3, whose hips are now ripening. I described in the 1986 *American Rose Annual* how *R. carolina alba* was effective in breaking down the barrier between *R. laevigata* and *R. bracteata*. I am hoping that *R. carolina alba* will eventually aid in breaking down many barriers between #86-3 and other roses. It should also improve hardiness since it was native to Maine.

I will be glad to send budwood of #86-3 to rose breeders who live in the South and have understocks. You need only let me know when your understocks are receptive.

AMERICAN ROSE SOCIETY ROSE CLASSIFICATION

Peter A. Haring
1024 Gayle Street
Shreveport, LA 71104

Pete Haring is a past district and regional director, is responsible for the establishment of the American Rose Center Trial Grounds and rose photographic contests for ARS, and is the editor of Modern Roses 9. He is the recipient of the Outstanding Consulting Rosarian Award, the Outstanding Judge Award, and two Silver Honor Medals—from the New York State and Gulf Districts.

One of the first tasks undertaken by the ARS Classification Committee in 1989 was to define the 56 classes recognized by ARS. You will find the names of these 56 classes listed in the front of both *Modern Roses 9* and the *Handbook For Selecting Roses*. To the best of the writer's knowledge, these classes had never been defined in toto for the committee's use. It seemed wise to establish a written basis from which to consider possible modifications.

In 1969, the American Rose Society tried a new classification system. Roses were grouped as III-A, etc., disregarding parentage entirely and based on "consistent horticultural characteristics." (See the 1969 *American Rose Annual*, page 29, for further details.) The system was used in the 1968 through 1974 *Annals* and *Handbooks*. It was based on a classification system used for daffodils. This classification system died a very quiet death.

There have been other studies and proposed new rose classification systems in recent years. Perhaps the most important of these is the new system recognized by the World Federation of Rose Societies. This system evolved from work done in the Royal National Rose Society on the premise that the rose world can no longer use parentage as the basis of a rose classification system. The WFRS system did not change the classes of old garden roses to any degree, but did rename "Floribunda" to "Cluster Flowered" and "Hybrid Tea" to "Large Flowered". These two changes seem to be the most unpopular features of the system and have not been supported. The American Rose Society has, in fact, rejected it. Another