

A NEW LOCALITY FOR MIOCENE MAMMALS

SOME time ago Mr. William Stein, one of my students, brought me a fragment of the lower jaw of some equine, containing two teeth, excellently preserved. The specimen was found at his father's ranch at Troublesome, in Middle Park Colorado, in the course of making a well. It was about thirty feet from the surface, in red soil. As no Miocene beds have ever been reported from this region, the discovery is a remarkable one. Photographs of the specimen (three aspects) were made and sent to Dr. J. W. Gidley, of the National Museum. He very kindly replied that it was difficult to determine the species, but the characters shown seemed to place it rather definitely in the genus *Parahippus*. The horizon was Middle or Upper Miocene. Dr. W. D. Matthew also kindly examined the photographs, and thought the animal was correctly referred to *Parahippus*, and of Miocene age.

Mr. S. A. Rohwer made a trip to Troublesome, in order to search for further materials, but although he carefully examined all the surrounding region, he could not find any fossils. It seems probable that the deposit is quite local, and it may be that only extensive excavations at the Stein ranch will uncover the fossiliferous beds.

T. D. A. COCKERELL

UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO

EDUCATION AND THE TRADES

I READ with much interest "The High School Course," by President David Starr Jordan in *The Popular Science Monthly* for July. While the tenor and purpose of the article as a whole are commendable, as progressive and liberal, one sentence contained therein shows that President Jordan is not unlike the orthodox ministers and church members, who pride themselves upon their broad-mindedness in having renounced the fire and brimstone hell, although they still hold fast to the devil—or who would look after the bad people, pray?

The sentence to which I refer is the following:

But the purpose of this training must be intel-

lectual, not to teach a trade, and only secondarily to fit for engineering courses of the universities.

Not to teach a trade! Why not lift the trades out of the gutter? and acknowledge them to be suitable, yea, fertile fields for intellectual activity?

President Jordan says:

The development of manual training of some sort for all boys and girls will represent the greatest immediate forward step in secondary education.

Why? Simply because it is an approach toward the proper recognition and appreciation of that which is practical and useful.

In noting the great hue and cry which has gone over the country against child labor, I have often thought that these children who labor are not much more sinned against than the school children who are shut up in school rooms day after day and forced to study things which seem wholly foreign to their lives. They are obliged to sacrifice their most receptive years to the old traditional idea of education which consisted in the acquisition of so-called *intellectual knowledge*; of knowledge which was out of the reach of the working people, held aloft and kept free from contamination with the vulgar trades; knowledge which could never be degraded by use, in earning a living. Is it not high time that we break away from these shackles of tradition, and no longer wrong the trades by ostracizing them and considering the mastery of a trade something separate and apart from an intellectual pursuit?

A trade is defined as:

An occupation, especially mechanical employment, as distinguished from the "*liberal arts*"—the learned professions, and agriculture. As, we speak of the trade of a smith, of a carpenter, or a mason, but, not now of the trade of a farmer, or a lawyer, or a physician.

This *now*, in the definition, shows that the farmer, lawyer and physician used to belong among the "tradespeople."

The intellectual boundaries will not suffer if the trades enter in. The old "no-trespassing" signs must come down, and the *trade-idea* must be elevated and placed upon a par with the so-called liberal arts.

It harks back to the old-world ideas of nobility and caste to insist upon a separation of the cultivation of the intellect, and the use that may be made of such cultivation.

Why should it be unworthy or undignified, and devoid of intellectual profit, to teach carpentering and plumbing, cooking and dressmaking, etc., instead of *manual training*, and *domestic science*? Is it not a foolish remnant of old-world pride, a relict of false aristocracy to which we feel we must cling, for fear the old world may sneer at our democracy?

A president of a university once said to me:

If any one in speaking of our department of domestic science should call it a cooking school, just take a club to him, in my name.

In discussing some elaborately concocted dish, with a graduate of this department of domestic science, I remarked that too much time and labor were consumed in its preparation to justify its place in a menu, and she replied:

O, I just learned how to make it in order to be able to teach in a domestic science department in some college, you know!

So it seems that our manual training is more or less entangled with the prevailing ideas about intellectuality and—the trades.

It is considered actually dangerous to open our curricula doors to the great arena of practicability, for fear of the over-cultivation of the material nature at the expense of the *inner life*. Let me quote from a recent university commencement address:

Educational science regards the development of the inner life as the true course, and yet it is almost entirely neglected in both common school and college. A material education is the one sought, and though this is against all philosophy, it is kept up by the clamor and clatter of the world's perverted ideals. The true doctrine is preached in the halls of education and finds eloquent advocacy in school literature, but when it comes to real experience it recoils before the money-making, pleasure-getting and fame-achieving anxieties of the schools.

The energy of the school purpose is diverted almost wholly to how to make a living, while how to live, which is the greater quest, is quite neglected.

In this age of the world it seems utter folly to philosophize about the outer and the inner life, as if they were two separate and distinct entities.

Imagine the world intent upon the cultivation of the inner life—having renounced its worldly zeal in making a material living! Commerce would go to sleep and civilization would drop back into barbarism. The consensus of opinion of the thinking world to-day is that the status of commercialism in any country is an index to the condition of civilization in that country. Every kind of labor may be the means of the cultivation of the outer and the inner life, but the inner life will never be lifted to a higher, spiritual plane by decrying what is popularly called the money-getting-sin. The inner life can only develop as the outer life prepares the way; the two are bound together and no philosophy can rend them asunder.

Only by teaching honestly what the world needs, and can use, may the schools accomplish their lofty aims.

It is a slow and wasteful method to try to help on the progress of general education by forcing an overflow of the *liberal arts* down into the trades, by way of the public schools. The better way would be to help the trades themselves to climb to more and more increased proficiency by the aid of the public schools and higher institutions of learning.

STELLA V. KELLERMAN

PROVINCIAL MUSEUMS

PROFESSOR C. C. NUTTING has recently written a very suggestive paper entitled "The Function of the Provincial Museum,"¹ which the writer has read with great interest. On page 169 the following statement occurs, which requires emendation:

One has to look in vain for such a museum in our central states, the nearest approach to it being our own museum at Davenport. But the time is coming when such institutions will rank in importance with either of the other classes enumerated above.²

¹ *Proc. Daven. Acad. Sci.*, X., p. 167.

² Referring to the University and Metropolitan museums.