

RIJEČ UREDNIŠTVA

DRŽAVNI ISPITI ZA SAMOSTALNO VOĐENJE ŠUMSKOG GOSPODARSTVA

U prošlosti smo se dvobroju Šumarskoga lista, obilježavajući 250. obljetnicu hrvatskoga šumarstva, osvrnuli na tekstove iz prvih godina njegovog tiskanja, povlačeći paralelu s današnjicom. Zbog uvida u povijesni slijed šumarske struke i interesantnost, pa i aktualnost tekstova, u ovome se dvobroju osvrćemo na tri teksta iz 1880. i 1881. god. vezana uz naslov. Prvi tekst odnosi se na „Naredbu c. k. ministarstva za poljodjelstvo od 13. veljače 1875, B 129/A. M., R.-G.-Bl. Br. 9, koja se odnosi na ispit za tehničko službovanje u državnoj šumskoj upravi“ (po toj su Naredbi državni ispit polagali državni službenici u resornim ministarstvima u Pešti i Beču, da bi bili osposobljeni za rad u državnoj službi). Drugi tekst odnosi se na „Dopis od 3. studena 1880. Br. 24509, kojim poziva Visoka kralj. zemaljska vlada ravnateljstvo Kralj. šumarskoga i gospodarskog učilišta u Križevcima, da sastavi posebno povjerenstvo koje bi imalo čim prije izraditi osnovu za preustrojstvo vladine naredbe od 10. siječnja god. 1850. tičuće se šumarskih državnih ispita u obće“. Tako je Osnovu nove naredbe o polaganju državnog ispita za samostalnu šumarsku upravu u Hrvatskoj i Slavoniji, sačinilo povjerenstvo u sastavu: F. Ž. Kesterčanek, Dragutin Hlava i Vladimir Kiseljak, a ona se kao i naredba iz 1875. ponajprije temelji na spomenutoj Naredbi od 16. siječnja iz 1850. god. i iskustvima susjednih zemalja. Ispit se održava svake godine u svibnju. Kandidat mora imati završen odgovarajući studij šumarstva, s dobrim ocjenama iz glavnih predmeta i najmanje trogodišnju praksu. Ispit je pismeni i usmeni, a provjerava se znanje iz predmeta: a) Šumogojstvo, b) Zaštita šuma i šumsko redarstvo, c) Šumska tehnologija i uporaba, d) Geodezija, e) Ustanovljivanje šumskih obhodnja, gospodarskih osnova . . . , f) Šumarska taksacija. . . . s osobitim obzirom na proračunavanje vrijednosti šuma, šumarsko-financijsko gospodarenje. . . , g) Šumarsko graditeljstvo (šumski putovi i prometila kao i po šumarstvo važne gradjevine. . . . h) Državno šumarsko upravnoslovlje (šumski zakon, naredbe), i sl.), i) Odnosaj privatnog prava prema šumarstvu i lovstvu, j) Temeljna načela neposrednog oporezovanja, k) Obća načela lovstva, l) Obći pregled ratarstva“. Nakon 8-satnog pismenog, drugi dan je dvosatni javni usmeni ispit za svakog kandidata, a potom nakon nekoliko dana slijedi konačni „u obližnjoj kojoj šumariji ili šumi“. Kandidat se nakon ispita „može proglasiti „odlično“ ili pako samo „jednostavno osposobljenim“, a nesposobnim pronađeni kandidat može ispit ponoviti u roku, što mu ga ispitno povjerenstvo (od tri člana) ustanovi“. U Naredbi iz 1875. posebno smo uočili dio paragrafa u kojemu se kaže: „Ispitni povjerenik, koji je s kojim kandidatom u rodu ili u tastbinstvu, ne smije kod izpita istoga kandidata prisutan biti“, a interesantno je napomenuti da se za prijavu ispita, uz diplomu i potvrdu o radnom stažu u struci, traže i stručne primjedbe i zabilješke koje je kandidat vodio tijekom radnoga staža. U ova dva teksta cilj nam je bio prikazati već tadašnju potrebu, propis, način polaganja i obujam

materije za polaganje državnog ispita, a u trećemu (vežući ga usputno za današnje političko kadrovanje), nalazimo odgovor na pitanje naslovljeno u članku:

„Usposobljuje li položeni drž. šumarski ispit za samostalno vođenje službe i za najviše šumarske službe?“ Ako ga sami sebi postavimo, odgovor bi bio „da“, no ako stavimo ruku na srce i budemo iskreni „pa ćemo morati priznati, da je ipak velika razlika biti šumarskim upraviteljem ili ravnajućim visokim činovnikom. Tko vidi, što se dan na dan zbiva, naći će, da ima vrlo mnogo šumara, koji su pod nadzorom vrstnoga i svjesnoga nadčinovnika ne samo najbolji upravni činovnici, već kadkad upravo odlično postupaju u poslovanju; nu ako se oni odmaknu od svoje svere ili im se obzirom na dosadanje poslovanje predaje vrhovna uprava, pokazuju ovi inače toli vješti činovnici toliku nespretnost i počimaju obično tako naopako gospodariti, te se mora i proti volji pomisliti, da su potpuno nevješti. Ne ima svatko sposobnosti, da ono bude, što hoće, i uz najbolju volju može se dogoditi, da komu njegove vlastite naravne sposobnosti reknu: *dovde i ne dalje. Ne treba tumačenja, da uslied ovakovih pogriješaka trpi ponajprije šuma*“.

U daljnjem tekstu sugerira se umjerenost, spoznaja vlastitih sposobnosti i napredovanje pojedinca kroz praksu, korak po korak „do one časti, kojoj može po svojih sposobnostih najbolje zadovoljavati“. Glede stanja nakon položenog državnog ispita i cijeloživotnog obrazovanja, kritički se osvrće na „izpitane šumare. Većina njih, osvjedočena, da je „svoju svrhu postigla“, ne radi ništa, knjige bacila na stranu, na slavohlepnost je zaboravila, svi su postali prosti i dobroćudni građani, koji u miru sade svoj kupus, i samo nuzgredno obavljaju svoju službu kao šumari, što već davno i nisu. Drugi su opet nemirne glave, puni ideja, od kojih se pako ni jedna ne obistinjuje, jer kakove imadu hire, tako im se mijenjaju i osnove; . . . progutaju sve knjige, ali malo od toga čestita zapamte, . . . njihov je rad kadkad izvrstan, nu nikad trajan. . . i rietko kad komu koristi. Baš od ovih polaze naši, toli slabo „cienjeni veleumi!“ Treći dio napokon, i to najmanji, jest cviet šumogojaca. Ugled njihova zvanja, koje su odabrali, im je prvo. Oni ne ostaju na stepenu časti, koju su postigli položivši državni ispit, već znajući, da sad tek počima pravi študij njihove struke, i da se u životu ništa ne uči, da se vremenom opet zaboravi, pomnožuju svoje znanje i izobrazuju se kao muževi, svjestni si svoje svrhe. No, i među tom elitom šumarske struke nisu svi jednaki, i oni imaju svaki svoj limit, pa „gdjekoji obnašaju časti, koje im ne pripadaju, niti bi ih postigli da se je gledalo njihovo znanje.“ Želeći dobro šumarskoj struci, „kad napokon neće biti kod naše struke prepoznanih veleuma, već gdje će svaki pripadnik šumarske struke sam si stvoriti službu, dokle već sižu njegove sposobnosti. To vrieme bit će zora sjajnoj budućnosti šumoznanstva!“

EDITORIAL

STATE EXAMS FOR INDEPENDENT MANAGEMENT OF A FOREST ENTERPRISE

In the last double issue of *Forestry Journal*, which was dedicated to the 250th anniversary of Croatian forestry, we reviewed the texts from the first years of its printing and drew a parallel with the present. In order to gain an insight into the historical sequence of the forestry profession and the interesting and contemporary nature of the texts, this double issue will focus on three texts from 1880 and 1881 dealing with the subject title. The first text refers to the "Instruction of the Ministry of Agriculture of February 13, 1875, B 129/A. M., R.-G.-Bl.No.9, dealing with the exam for technical service in the state forestry administration" (according to this Instruction, state exams were taken by civil servants in the competent ministries in Budapest and Vienna, which qualified them for work in the public service). The second text refers to the "Letter of November 3, 1880, No. 24509, in which the High Royal Government invites the Administration of the Royal Forestry and Agriculture College in Križevci to form a special commission for the purpose of drawing up a basis for the reformation of the governmental instruction of January 10, 1850, relating to forestry state exams in general". The Basis of the new instruction for state exams for independent forestry administration in Croatia and Slavonia was drawn up by a commission consisting of F. Ž. Kesterčanek, Dragutin Hlava and Vladimir Kiseljak. Like the instruction of 1875, the new instruction was also primarily based on the already mentioned Instruction of January 16, 1850, as well as on the experience from neighbouring countries. The exam was held in May every year. A candidate had to have completed a study of forestry and received good grades in the main subjects, and had to have at least three years of working experience. The exam was in written and oral form, and the subjects included: a) Silviculture, B) Forest protection and forest service, c) Forest technology and use, d) Geodesy, e) Establishment of forest control, Management plans, ..., f) Forest inventory ... with particular reference to the calculation of forest value, forest-financial management ..., g) Forest civil engineering (forest roads and vehicles, as well as forest structures ..., h) State forest legislation (forest laws, instructions, and similar), i) Relationship between private rights on forestry and hunting, j) Basic principles of direct taxation, k) General principles of hunting management, and l) General review of farming". The 8-hour written part of the exam was followed by a two-hour public oral exam for each candidate. Several days later the final exam was taken in a "nearby forest office or a forest". After the exam, the candidate might receive the following grades: "excellent" or "just competent", while those found incompetent could retake the exam on a date set by a three-member examining board". The Instruction of 1875 contains a part of the paragraph stating the following: "An examiner who is a candidate's blood relative or a relative-in-law must not be present at the exam of the said candidate". It is interesting to note that in order to take the exam, the candidates had to submit not only their diploma and a document confirming their work in the profession, but also professional comments and notes they kept in the course of work.

These two texts show that the method of taking state exams and the amount of the matter examined were regulated very early. The third text (related to the present politically-based appointments) gives an answer to the question raised in the article:

"Does passing the state forestry exam qualify a candidate for an independent running of the highest forestry service?" If we answer the question ourselves, the answer is "yes", but if we are honest, "we must admit that there is a great difference between being a forest manager and a managing high servant. Those who are aware of what is happening day by day will find that there are very many foresters who, supervised by a competent and conscientious superior servant, become not only the best managing servants but also the best workers; however, if removed from their sphere or if appointed to run the highest administration, those otherwise competent servants display such ineptitude and begin to manage in such an inappropriate manner that one cannot help but conclude that they are utterly incompetent. **Not everybody is capable of being what he wants to be; try as hard as one might, one's own natural abilities tell you: you can get no further than this. Needless to say, it is the forest that suffers most in the aftermath of such errors**".

The text goes on to recommend moderation, an awareness of one's own abilities and individual advancement through practical work, step by step, "up to that honourable position which can be best fulfilled by one's abilities". As for the status after passing the state exam and lifelong learning, the text critically reviews "foresters that have passed the state exam. The majority of them, satisfied with the fact that "they have achieved their purpose", do nothing, throw away the books, forget ambition and turn into simple and well-meaning citizens who plant their cabbage in peace and only carry out their service as foresters in passing. Others, on the other hand, are restless and full of ideas, of which none are realized; their whims are followed by their changing priorities; ... they avidly read all the books but remember hardly anything, ... their work is sometimes excellent but never of long lasting ... and is rarely useful for anybody. This is where the majority of our, so badly "appreciated geniuses" originate. The third part, the smallest one, is the crown of forest managers. The reputation of the profession which they have chosen is their utmost priority. They do not bask in the glory of passing the state exam, but, knowing that this is where the true study begins and that the things learned at one time are usually forgotten later on, broaden their knowledge and educate themselves as men with a purpose firmly in mind". Yet, there are differences even among this elite of the forestry profession. Each of them has their own limit, so "some are in honourable positions that do not rightfully belong to them, nor would they achieve them if their knowledge was the foremost criterion." Our profession will advance and benefit "when we finally do away with the geniuses of the profession, and when every member of the forestry profession creates the service himself according to their abilities. This moment will mark the dawn of a splendid future of the forestry science!"

Editorial Board