



Established 1887

The Weekly News and Literary Journal of The University of New Brunswick

Member Canadian University Press

Honorary Editor — Rt. Hon. Lord Beaverbrook

Editor-in-Chief—Ralph G. Hay.

FORESTRY STAFF

Editor-in-Chief—BILL NETTLETON.

Managing Editor John Dunfield
 Feature Editor Bob Dickson
 Staff Photographer Len Lockart
 Reporter John Wickes
 Contributors Dave Etheridge, Dave Munn, John Topp,
 Bill Cawthray, Wally Montgomery.

Deadlines—Tuesday noon for news, (Thursday noon for late breaks),
 Saturday noon for feature.

Subscriptions—\$2.00 per year. For advertising rates communicate
 with the Business Manager.

Authorized as second-class mail, Post Office Department, Ottawa.
 The Brunswickan Office—"K" Hut, Dial 8424.

Vol. 69

FREDERICTON, N. B., OCTOBER 31, 1949

No. 4

What Lies Ahead

An editorial may or may not be of consequence in the lives of the undergraduates to whom it is addressed. I hope that this particular editorial, dedicated to the final class of student veterans in Forestry to leave this University, will serve its intended purpose. Many of us are unfortunately prone to dwell on the black side of our profession. We read much in the press and in the minutes of societies that tends to paint a dreary picture of wars and rumours of wars, of reduction in staff requirements in industry and government, and of mass unemployment. I am hardly in a position to say that some of this may not be possible, perhaps before we leave this University, however, I can with some authority alleviate the strain of this mental conflict.

No higher authority than the Acting Dominion Forester, Mr. D. A. MacDonald, not only fails to agree with this dreary outlook but clearly sees many reasons for optimism. Worry about future employment, about overcrowded fields and changing policy has always been with the new graduate. The present comparison between the immediate post-war boom and today's gradual recession is clear-cut yet not by any means prophetic. Companies who have employed Foresters and have been forced to reduce their staff due to curtailed operations are not, in Mr. MacDonald's opinion, likely to disperse with their services entirely. Foresters have rendered a service which is not easily replaced. Those not taken this year will most assuredly be re-engaged at a later date.

One of the basic reasons for this assurance is changing government policy. Ever since the Kennedy Report on Forest conditions in Ontario, government and public interest in the future of our woodlands has increased. The year 1950 will possibly prove to be a momentous one in the lives of every member of the woodlands trade and in particular the professional Forester. The sweeping changes in policy, long overdue, will require hundreds of Foresters, trained in every phase of logging, products and biology to direct and correlate the separate endeavours. The demands of industry will follow government policy, and as a cooperative undertaking they too will require, rather than disperse with, the services of trained Foresters.

This glowing portrait of things to come, however, does not mean that each and every one of us will ride this "gravy train." It will be the trained man that they will want, not anyone who has simply absorbed a minimum knowledge and no practical field experience. Above all, Mr. MacDonald stressed management as the key to a brighter future in Forestry. The basis for new and sweeping changes will be the proper management of our forest resources, and the graduate possessing above average qualifications in that field will have a comfortable margin over his competitors.

Whatever his chosen field of endeavour the final analysis must depend on personal qualities of initiative and interest in Forestry, and in Canada. Despite the condition of the labour market the man with the ability, the interest and the initiative will always get ahead. That old adage about the right place for the right man depends on no particular economic condition, no fortunate government policy but entirely and squarely upon you—the individual.

Grants and/or Gifts

(DALHOUSIE GAZETTE)

In a recent address to the members of the University of Toronto Club, Dr. A. W. Trueman, President of the University of New Brunswick, commented on the growing need for federal government assistance to universities. He based this necessity upon increased enrolments and higher operating costs.

At first glance, it would seem that increased enrolments were a thing of the past, and consequently an invalid reason for federal grants. University statistics throughout the country show ten to fifteen per cent student declines. But most of these are caused by the graduation of veterans, and increased civilian enrolments are with us. A country with an ever-increasing population and, at the same time, ever-increasing educational standards, cannot but expect to see more students desiring higher learning.

In the years immediately following the war, universities were required to cope with vastly increased student bodies, with no comparable increase in revenue. It is a well known fact that fees alone do not cover the costs of a university. And yet, only fees reached college coffers . . . there were no compensating government grants. Now, with even this source of revenue withdrawn, our universities must meet higher operating costs, in salaries, maintenance, and deferred maintenance expenses.

In the days of large fortunes, low operating costs, and fewer students, universities could be expected to subsist on endowments. But the above facts reveal the impossibility of continuing this method of subsistence.

Dr. Trueman is president of a governments-upported university—the Provincial Government of New Brunswick, and his statements would indicate that even that is insufficient.

There are many objections, we know, to state subsidized education. Perhaps these objections were responsible for the delegation of educational matters to the Provinces in the British North America Act. After all, it was drawn at a time when the slightest suspicion of government control was odious to the individualists who planned it. But times change, populations shift and increase, competition and therefore educational requirements become stiffer, and yet the field of education seems to be the only one in which national government has not recognized the fact.

As has so often been proven in Canada, there is nothing incompatible in private and public entities pursuing similar endeavours. Why, then, should it be amiss for the government to aid endowed universities, or run a few of its own? We would not be submitting ourselves to a yoke of state-dictated theories. We would be availing ourselves of funds collected in proportion to ability to pay . . . funds which would reach the universities in a steady flow and permit long-range and integrated planning.

Campus Editors Hit Hard

By MURRAY SMITH,
Editor, The Manitoban

As student editors across Canada took up their pens for another year's writing old and new issues vied for their attention.

The Queen's JOURNAL's first editorial pointed out to seniors and frosh alike that Queen's renewed participation in NFCCS had both responsibilities and benefits, but that the move marked a reawakening of interest in the national student picture.

At Toronto, Queen's, and McGill editors were hot against the Americans for refusing a visa for Queensman, Glen Shortell, on his way to lecture at Washington University. Comment ranged from a mild sense of indignation in the JOURNAL to a bombastic attack in the VARSITY.

Although ready to grant the Americans complete control over their immigration, the VARSITY thought they were needlessly inconveniencing Canadian citizens by their present "witch-hunt." THE MANITOBA took it easier, pointing out only that our southern neighbors might be hurting their own democracy by such tactics.

Out on the west coast, controversy has been raging over the ISS, DP scholarship plans, with the UBSEY taking the stand that the funds, now frozen, should be released for more grants. The paper then found it necessary to criticize the student council for calling a general meeting when the Council itself had all the necessary powers to deal with the matter.

Western Ontario and McGill seem to have a minor war on their hands, with Western's GAZETTE accusing McGill of using professional players on their squad. The DAILY has replied that there is no rule against using the so-called "senior amateur" players and that all Redmen must have high marks to get athletic grants.

The XAVIERIAN supplied alternate bouquets and brickbats for

their campus hazing system, claiming at one time that neither frosh nor sophs were taking the thing in the right spirit. McGill commented on the "new and experimental" hazing on their campus and pointed with pride to the unique "Wiggies," special hats designed to promote school spirit.

The UBSEY set out to hang the campus ebookstore, charging that despite promises of "substantial reductions," prices in the store were as high as those in public shops. It also pointed out that understaffing the stores meant annoying line-ups and long periods of waiting.

The editor of the Acadia ATHLETIC noted that the \$5.00 increase in student fees was hardly a matter of preference but rather one of dire necessity and that the dividends reaped from the fee were constantly increasing.

Leaving the home scene for awhile, Saskatchewan's SHEAF and the Queen's JOURNAL came out with some questions on foreign policy. The former claimed that our increasing association with Tito raised doubts as to our opposition to communism. Are we, the writer asked, opposing Russia because communism is a threat to democracy or because Russia's power is a threat to ours?

The JOURNAL asked whether it wasn't time for an evaluation of our own political system, instead of continual censure of anything new or foreign, claiming that we might be closing the door to democratic change by present attitudes.

The SHEAF also commented interestingly on the difference between European students on the campus and the home-brown variety. It was claimed that too many Canadians were thinking only of the diploma and job, while many Europeans still retained the classical concept of "education for life."

Ivan and Eisenstein

In line with the policy of the U.N.B. Film Society to bring before the students the most outstanding films which the studios of the WHOLE world have to offer, IVAN THE TERRIBLE is to be presented in the Teachers College Auditorium at 7:30 p.m. this coming Wednesday, November 2nd.

Merely to state that this is an outstanding film is to employ a hackneyed phrase, as well as to be guilty of a deliberate understatement. For Ivan the Terrible embodies a combination of treats. Eisenstein the greatest producer, Cherkassov the greatest actor, and Prokofiev, whom many believe the

greatest composer of modern Russia, collaborated in the making of the film. The splendour of the acting and the impressiveness of the background music will be readily apparent to those who attend the showing next Wednesday. Yet a few words concerning Eisenstein the producer, might enhance our appreciation of his achievement.

Eisenstein was a man of the most vigorous and unusual intellectual stature. He was an incorrigible individualist. Born in Riga, 1898, of Jewish descent, and growing into manhood during the revolutionary years, he first studied architecture. Soon he drifted into film producing

and, at the age of 27, produced the renowned film "Potemkin." Thereafter one triumph led to another. At the same time, Eisenstein was hastily studying languages; and he learned not only to read but to write and lecture in French, German, Spanish and English. He read voraciously everything that might aid him in his chosen art. And he made marginal film notes in all that he read, from novels to sociology.

While sojourning in Hollywood during the late 1930's, Eisenstein made certain outspoken remarks which had reverberations in the Kremlin. From that point his difficulties at home began. But even in America, while making fast friends with Sam Goldwyn, he had a serious disagreement with Upton Sinclair.

There is no doubt that Eisenstein loved his native Russia. Yet he was simply not the sort to completely knuckle down to anyone—Stalin included. And so he returned to Russia, but was disconsolate. He sulked, and lectured, but would not do any producing. When a Soviet Film Jubilee was held, top honours were handed out to other "good party" directors, but the great Eisenstein was conspicuously ignored. This was due to a reported dictum of Stalin—the nearest English equivalent of which might be: "I'm damned if the rascal gets anything until he wakes up and does some creative work again." Some time later he started to produce another picture, but he could make no headway; something was lacking. On seeing this, the Central Committee of the Communist Party, suspicious of ideas which Eisenstein might have picked up in America—maybe he was out to sabotage the Soviet film industry by withholding his talents!—accused him of being that horrible thing, a capitalist-tainted Russian, as well as a formalist, and an egoist, etc., etc., etc. But all to little effect on Eisenstein.

Finally he was sent away—theoretically "punished"—on a long holiday to one of the most exquisite southern resorts in the whole U.S.S.R. It was suggested that he produce a film. He was promised full choice of subject, with no restraint whatever. And he gave rein to Prokofiev as his musician-colaborator. With all this cajoling, Eisenstein came to life again; for his one passionate desire was met—to pursue his art without restrictions. Some time after his holiday, he went to Central Asia, and there, in 1944, he produced the first part of his monumental Ivan the Terrible. He had hardly finished the second part when he had a stroke. In hospital he learned that the picture had been listed by the Soviet authorities as historically false. He died in 1948 before completing preparation on a new "ordered" version.

Eisenstein was held in great esteem in Great Britain. Following his death, the British Film Institute organized in London a memorial film performance of selections from his chief films. His masterpiece, Ivan the Terrible, is the first Soviet film to be presented by the U.N.B. Film Society. Whether or not it may be the last will depend on the students' reaction to it. At least it should be clearer, after this presentation, that the studios of no one nation have an absolute monopoly in the film productions of the motion picture art.

NO IN-BETWEENS

Shooting game birds for sport is one of those human activities in which there can be no middle ground of opinion. It is completely indefensible in the minds of those who do not shoot and just as completely irresistible in the minds of those who do.

I Know Where I'm Going

We have it on good authority that a certain fellow travels everywhere loaded down with compasses, chains, birdseed wild rice, walkie-talkie, radar, insurance policies (double indemnity), flares, 10,000 rounds of H.B., clothed in scarlet red and completely surrounded by a small party of twenty.

PATRONIZE BRUNSWICKAN ADVERTISERS. It pays!

THE RANGER SCHOOL

By "HANK" BLENN

The Maritime Forest School, situated atop Mar on the edge of the U.N., was founded in 1945 the combined efforts of the ments of New Brunswick Scotia and the major for tries of these provinces.

Operated in affiliation University of New Brunswick objective of the school vide vocational forestry which will bridge the gap the lumberjack with lit academic background and est Engineer with four of of professional training versity. The Ranger School includes basic which will enable a gr work with either governm cies or private industry others, such courses as scaling, timber cruising forest improvements, and rammetry are presented, (continued on page 1)



Lady An
TWIN SET! Fancy cable
In pullover, across shoulder
cardigan. All wool, po
priced, everywhere.

Lady An
TORONTO, CANADA

pe

THE ENGINEERS.

... BECAUSE THEY'RE