better job for themselves and their land. Anyone who earnestly wants to further the practice of sound range management has a receptive audience waiting for him.

—Raymond M. Housely, Jr., Student, School of Forestry and Range Management, Colorado Agricultural and Mechanical College, Fort Collins.

What Should the Goal of Range Education Be?

Range management is a youngster among college curricula. Data secured from schools offering degrees in range management indicate that but two schools offered a bachelor's degree in range management prior to 1930. Although instruction in this field was begun earlier than this, it is perhaps safe to say that the development of range education has occurred in the last forty years, with the major expansion having occurred within the last twenty-five years.

The major problems surrounding the development of a curriculum are associated with the many related fields of science which concern the range manager. It is difficult to see how one can be an effective range administrator without some reasonable knowledge of animal husbandry, agronomy, both soils and field crops, agricultural economics, public administration, and forestry, to name but a few of the more obvious. Some knowledge of few of these could properly be omitted from a course of training for a rancher. Yet, each of these has a sufficiently large body of information to occupy a full curriculum. How then can we hope to supply sufficient training in the field of range management and at the same time include the essential training from these related fields to make the range graduate an effective land administrator or ranch manager?

A further complication arises from the fact that the needs of the student for knowledge in these related fields vary considerably with the employment position of the individual. What will be essential information to one individual may be but helpful subsidiary information to another. Stated briefly, those responsible for developing a course of range instruction have little time, an almost unlimited amount of information, and no precise knowledge of the individual needs after graduation of the students for whom the range curriculum is being devised.

One solution is to elaborate the number of courses required so that an individual receives training in all the possibly useful areas of knowledge. This obviously can extend the required number of courses beyond that which can possibly be covered in the time available to the college student. Moreover, it is likely to develop into the elaboration of trivia and the emphasis upon operational details rather than upon fundamental and basic information.

Given the two alternatives of familiarizing the student with the details of the day to day operation of a particular job and providing a considerable and broad background in the problems involved and their significance from the standpoint of human relations, the latter seems to me imminently to be the better. An illustration may serve to clarify this point of view. One could obviously spend a good deal of time in elaborating the actual commensurate property requirements of the Forest Service from area to area. No doubt such information might be useful and helpful to the student, particularly should he later find himself working as a district ranger. However, would understanding not be better reached by pointing out that the commensurability problem is but one phase of more basic
problems dealing with land tenure and landlord-tenant relations? The first course presumes that the present procedures are finally correct and that we are simply training individuals. The second more correctly assumes that improvements will come about so fast as those concerned are aware in a broad way of the fundamental problems involved. This applies equally well should the graduate be the rancher rather than the administrator.

It is not contended that technical skill and operational “know how” need not be expected of the college graduate. It is true that all the technical skills and operational details which may possibly be useful to the graduate cannot be taught in the time available, and that these alone do not insure satisfactory accomplishment on the job. Moreover, it is easier to improve one’s skill and become familiar with the “tricks of the trade” on the job than it is to acquire a sound philosophy, and a basic understanding of fundamental problems. If range management as a profession is to make the most rapid advancement, we must instill understanding in the student even if it be at the expense of familiarization with the less important though relevant facts.

This is not to suggest that facts are not important, but to argue that “ideas about facts” are more so. When time demands that a choice must be made between alternatives let us be certain that the basic idea has been imparted. If the student has been stimulated to thinking in the particular field concerned, he can later acquire knowledge of the details and, moreover, he may uncover some new facts or provide some important new tools in the process.—Arthur D. Smith, Associate Professor, Range Management, Utah State Agricultural College, Logan.

THE SPIRIT OF SCHOLARSHIP

That is not scholarship which goes to work upon the mere formal pedantry of logical reasoning, but that is scholarship which searches for the heart of a man. The spirit of scholarship gives us catholicity of thinking, the readiness to understand that there will constantly swing into our ken new items not dreamed of in our systems of philosophy, not simply to draw our conclusions from the data that we have had, but that all this is under constant mutation, and that therefore new phases of life will come upon us and a new adjustment of our conclusions will be necessary. Our thinking must be detached and disinterested thinking.—Woodrow Wilson.