

SALIENT REQUIRES YOUR HELP

If you are interested in learning something about journalism, printing or merely who's who in the College, be at the STAFF MEETING on—

MONDAY, MARCH 30
at 8 o'clock in Salient room.
ALL WELCOME—SUPPER!!!

Salient

An Organ of Student Opinion at Victoria College, Wellington, N.Z.

Vol. 17, No. 4

Wellington, March 25, 1953.

By Subscription.

S. C. M.

Sunday Service

LITTLE THEATRE
March 29, 4 p.m.

All Welcome.

Preacher:

Rev. J. S. Somerville, M.C.,
M.A.

Tea to Follow.

The University of Wellington?

By DR. G. A. CURRIE, Vice-Chancellor, University of New Zealand

THE Editor has asked me to write some comments on Professor Gordon's article written in 1946 on "The University of Wellington." Fortunately for me, Professor Gordon has commented already in the March 4 issue of "Salient" on his earlier statement, and since, having seen the working of the University from inside a College and inside the University itself, he is much better informed on the subject than I am, I refer you again to his recent article, and content myself with some desultory comments on matters which strike a comparative newcomer.

I find myself in almost complete agreement with Professor Gordon's last contribution and you will see from it that many, perhaps most, of the disabilities of the Federal system outlined in the 1946 article have now disappeared.

Now I believe, as I think everyone in the University does, that the true universities "where young and old are joined together in the imaginative contemplation of learning," to use Whitehead's phrase, are the Colleges. A university is a place for the transmission of knowledge and the discovery of new knowledge; a place where teachers and students meet to pursue learning and where research goes on, and that description fits the Colleges and does not fit the office of the University of New Zealand. However, the University of New Zealand does perform many vital functions, some of which I may mention later, and through the exigencies of history is the body which has the power to require certain standards of academic attainment for admission to courses and for passing examinations and it is the only place in New Zealand with a charter for conferring degrees.

Is it justified in being a university at all? is a question you may reasonably ask. I cannot comment on this question: the University exists and the Senate is constantly striving to do its best to shape it into the most effective instrument for fulfilling its functions under the acts which set out its powers and duties. The central question you may really want me to answer is, Would the University Colleges (more specifically Victoria University College) be better as separate universities rather than as Constituent Colleges of the University of New Zealand?

My answer to that question can be neither yes nor no because nobody knows the answer, nor is it likely that a simple answer is even possible. For some things the Colleges might be better off if they could be separate, for other things they may be stronger linked together, and there are some central functions that may remain central even when they all become separate universities.

Fully independent universities in Dunedin, Christchurch, Auckland and Wellington will almost certainly come, but when, no one knows. They should arise, one would expect, when a majority of people who have the say in such matters—and that means mainly the Colleges, the Senate and the Government—are convinced that university education and the advancement of learning will be best served by separate institutions.

In the matter of scholarship, I personally believe that academic work is at its healthiest and most vigorous when each centre feels free to teach, learn and experiment in the way which its scholars think best. Even that statement must be qualified by the condition that a certain size, variety and quality of staff is necessary before any college can set its standards of scholarship at a high enough level. I do believe, however, that the University Colleges have reached a size and range of staff sufficient to warrant a large measure, possibly full, academic autonomy; in-

deed, the University has been moving towards that goal for some years and is even now examining further means of academic devolution.

You know, of course, that the old type examining University came to an end with the 1926 Act and the transfer of examining from Britain to New Zealand, and a new conception of a University rather than the model of the federal University of Wales, was initiated. The examining and degree-giving functions remain with the University and through an Academic Board of College teachers, the academic policy and standards for the whole system are determined. The Senate has the final say, but so far as I have seen, the great majority of Academic Board recommendations are accepted even if the process is rather slow. Incidentally, means to speed up the procedures—of which we do make heavy weather—are under discussion at the present moment.

Our University, including all the Colleges, is very much the size of the University of Melbourne, though of a different character. Here are the student statistics supplied to me for last year:

| Centre | Students Full-time | Students part-time | Total |
|--------|--------------------|--------------------|-------|
| Otago | 710 | 1,595 | 2,305 |
| C.U.C. | 1,071 | 981 | 2,052 |
| A.U.C. | 2,093 | 1,139 | 3,232 |
| V.U.C. | 1,735 | 628 | 2,363 |

Colleges of Agriculture are omitted because their student statistics are rather different from the general pattern.

I must explain that size has little relation to autonomy since some individual Indian universities, which are all federating-type universities, may have upwards of seventy thousand students. The University of California, which is one University with seven different campuses, has over forty thousand students, while there are unitary universities with less than a thousand students. The University of Tasmania has less than a thousand students while the University of Sydney has about ten thousand, practically all full-time.

Perhaps it is more realistic to ask whether scholarship is best served in New Zealand by one University or by four, and whether the central University is hampering or helping teachers and students in what and how they teach, and what they desire to learn? Again the first question is not a simple one since a single approach through a central Grants Committee to the Government for finance is imperative; the Special Schools have to be allocated from the centre; the interests of students who move between Colleges (and there were seven hundred of them this year) may be best safeguarded through a central body; Government departments are best dealt with centrally and there are other functions which would appear to be central of necessity. On the other hand teaching, examining, the recording of students' results and so on are probably best done in autonomous colleges. Although the very core of scholarship is the vital spark which passes between teacher and student, the availability of books in the library and the impact of student upon student—all the function of the Colleges; yet you can see that there are many other things contributing to scholarship which may be best carried out by a central body, whether it be called a university or not.

When I speak of contribution to scholarship, I mean contribution to the well-being of scholars, for I believe that administration which is inhuman is bad administration. Administration is the art and science of most efficiently, speedily and economically applying available means to produce desirable ends. The end pro-

duct the University seeks is scholarship, but that can only be gained through contributions at various levels to the well-being of the people who are the scholars.

In a limited academic sense the answer to the question "Would Victoria College be better as the University of Wellington?" would probably be Professor Gordon's qualified "yes," but of course the question cannot be set as a limited one.

The history of the provincial development of the Colleges, things as they are in our present acts, the central Dominion Government with one central purse, the problems of equivalence of standards and other areas in which co-operation is desirable, conspire together to prevent the question from being a limited one.

The Colleges have made big advances towards real independence in the last few years with the appointment of full-time executive heads and even now it is hard to see any real difficulty which the University places in the way of any teacher presenting what material he wants, in the manner he wants, before his students, or in the way of any student to pursue without hindrance a course of study he may desire. Perhaps the titles don't matter if the functions are being performed well.

It is not in a negative way that I regard the University, however. Only by positive contributions to the promotion of learning can the University justify its place, and only by constantly adjusting itself to serve best the changing requirements of scholarship should it survive. In

common with colleagues in the Colleges and on the Senate we are engaged in trying to do those very things, to adjust our constitution and procedures to be of best service to University education in New Zealand. The details of that are too long and complicated to go into here. The Senate itself has a majority of persons connected with the Colleges on its membership, so the shape of the future will be largely the shape for which that majority works. I am confident that if the Senate were convinced that the best service could be done to higher learning by pressing for the Colleges to become separate universities at any time, that course would be followed.

Meanwhile, speaking personally, if I may be permitted to do that, I find that all my activities—and I've had no time to be idle since I came here—have been directly, or indirectly, related to the well-being of students, helping to provide the best conditions available in which teachers, students and research workers may pursue their studies, and not to empty routine.

I miss greatly the opportunity for daily personal contacts with students and teachers. Compensation lies in the opportunity this central position gives for a service to the scholars in the Colleges which could not be rendered anywhere else. You may have to accept in simple faith my statement that I do find here opportunity for real service to the University which, though more remote from the student than that of a teacher and of a different kind, is, I firmly believe, equally significant.

THE INTERNATIONAL SPIRIT IN ACTION

THE overseas students' evening held last Thursday in the Little Theatre proved itself another success. The most important effect of this social gathering is the possibility of forming an International Club at Victoria to supplement the activities of the city club. A meeting will be held soon to decide this, and to determine the nature of the club's activities.

The convener of the evening was Miss Pauline Hoskins; no more suitable person to stimulate (by example) the flow of conversation can be imagined. (We hope that this passing reference will not be taken as an "attack.") The organisation, however remained very similar to that of last year's gathering. One very good innovation was the use of name tags, giving each person's names and country of origin. This did away with the necessity of formal introductions in many cases, and more valuably, one did not have to attempt to pronounce some of the names. This "name tag" system did much to encourage fraternisation and the same idea might be of some use for freshers during the first few weeks.

The number of people attending was approximately eighty, comprising about forty New Zealand born students, and the rest born in overseas countries, though naturally a large percentage of these were New Zealand citizens. The lengths some N.Z.ers went to claim foreign origin were surprising: one attractive young girl sported a name-tag giving "Utopia" as the country of origin—obviously she was someone's dream girl. Another student traced his ancestry to Scotland (1875) from Norway (1000 A.D.). There were twenty-two states represented: Pakistan, India, Ceylon, Holland, U.S.A., Canada, Malaya, China, Italy, Mauritius, Fiji, England, Scotland, Poland, Switzerland, Hungary, Australia, U.S.S.R., North Borneo, Latvia, Ger-

many, and Israeli. A notable omission from this list is France.

The convener, Miss Pauline Hoskins, in the middle of the evening, having welcomed the guests, called upon Professor McGechan "who by a happy co-incidence is on my right" to welcome the overseas students on behalf of Dr. Williams who was unfortunately unable to be present. This he did, and congratulated the student body on the function. He admired the idea and hoped that the evening would be continued. The President of V.U.C.S.A. (Mr. M. J. O'Brien) then welcomed the guests on behalf of the Association, and mentioned the presence of two people at the gathering who had had International House experience, Mrs. Celia Manson and the Reverend Gardiner-Scott. He expressed the wish that the overseas students would fit into this way of life without discomfort. He promised that the Executive would do all in its power to make them feel at home.

Miss Hoskins then discussed the possibilities of doing something further about making such gatherings permanent. There was a need for this as many overseas students boarded in rooms or hostels and had no easy way of meeting other people. It was up to the overseas students to say whether or not there be an overseas club. She suggested a fortnightly meeting, with talks by foreign students. An American student then offered his co-operation and

(Continued on Page 2)

Salient

ABUSE, MR. PRESIDENT?

THE keynote of Mr. M. J. O'Brien's letter in the last issue was in the word "abuse." This we could regard with equanimity had the President deigned to discuss our arguments, but forgetting that a personal attack on a writer does not negate his arguments on another matter, Mr. O'Brien attempted to win his case by muddling the debate with emotive oratorical rant and (in places) an unfortunate neglect of truth. He has concentrated so much upon the author that he has failed to build up a convincing case that our editorial was either an "attack" or abuse.

We do not attempt to defend our article; contained in it was enough sledge to soothe (one would think) even Mr. O'Brien's sensitive nature. The apology we made in the editorial itself for introducing "personalities" was surely indicative of our expressed desire not to "attack" either of the persons discussed. It is obvious that only a well-trained legal mind could determine (so fine was the line) that there was an "attack," especially as we are certain that neither Miss Hoskin nor Mr. McCaw would entertain the thought that we had "attacked" them. We are not ashamed publicly to admit the high regard we have for these two persons.

Neither—perhaps unfortunately—were we ashamed to admit that we thought that the interests of the Association would be better served by delegating two other individuals to the N.Z.U.S.A. Council meeting. The President is denying anyone—not only "Salient"—the right to express publicly a contrary opinion on N.Z.U.S.A. matters to that of the Executive. If every impartial criticism on Executive appointments is labelled an "attack" and its withdrawal requested by the President, where then is our hypothetical and mislabelled "freedom of the press." To be "an organ of student opinion" "Salient" does not necessarily have to be "an organ of Executive opinion" or refrain from criticising Executive affairs.

This brings us to an important point which had troubled us, for we could find no precedent for it. The President made a public statement defending the Executive in general and two of its members in particular. However, he neglected either before he wrote the statement or after it was in the hands of the Editor to notify the Executive officially of the actions he had taken on its behalf. Is it customary for the President to act as the Executive's protector without consulting or notifying the parties on whose behalf he takes it upon himself to act? It would have been far more politic on his part to have submitted his letter to the other legally-trained members for a critical examination; they would have been able (surely) to have made some improvements in the arguments.

Another point: the actual voting figures from the secret ballot which chose the delegates are usually kept secret. Mr. O'Brien, as chairman, made the voting figures public; this is another serious break from precedent. A secret ballot is a farce if the President can disclose voting figures when he wishes to prove a point, but keep them secret otherwise. Perhaps it would be advantageous to the Association to have these figures made public in future.

The list of Miss Hoskin's and Mr. McCaw's qualifications Mr. O'Brien included in his letter (apparently for the benefit of the Association—we are well aware of these things) was

charming, accurate and completely superfluous. We never denied these persons' qualifications in as far as they would be of use to a N.Z.U.S.A. delegate, but that is one of the points in question; that, and whether the two delegates would be able to use their qualifications to the Association's fullest benefit—the operative words are "use" and "fullest."

Mr. O'Brien suggested that we justify the charges of "chicanery and nepotism"; he has, however, by the very tone of his letter made that impossible. If we were to justify these charges we would be drawn inevitably into far more acrid personalities than before—and Mr. O'Brien has already shown how he treats an attempt to criticise Executive members. It would be better in this case to consider our remarks as merely opinions based on an intimate knowledge of Executive affairs.

The President considered any "allegations" as "libellous"; unfortunately, he must know that no judge, jurist or jury would agree that he had a case; therefore we suggest that he withdraw the word "libellous" or, as he wrote to us, "justify these charges." Such vituperative irrelevancies do little towards the clarification of the question, which we must both want.

However, in a lamentable exhibition of misrepresentation, Mr. O'Brien attempted to conclude his case by damning us. (This, by the way, was the paragraph he had not the nerve to read to us personally over the telephone when he courteously read the beginning.) We were not "taken for the ride" as he suggested, but attended last tournament in a representative capacity in the men's indoor basketball team. As editor of "Salient," we received no benefit from the Executive's acquiescence to send two "Salient" reporters to tournament. And in any case, it is no new procedure to send reporters to tournament, so why the fuss?

As for the second part (he didn't even mention—as he did the other—this part over the telephone) he says: "As editor of the host College newspaper . . . look so great an interest in . . . N.Z.U.S.A. that you did not bother to attend a single session. . . ." and he goes on triumphantly "Who's calling who what?" That is still in doubt, Mr. President. But the President's triumphant oratory at the end was a trifle misdirected. I was not editor of "Salient" during that tournament, a fact which, in his excitement, the President forgot to check. That would have been one advantage from referring his letter to the Executive before its submission.

We do not wish to develop the ramifications of this remark excessively, but as we have previously notified Mr. O'Brien of these comments and have given him permission to append a brief reply to this, hence our concern. He may ask why, despite the fact that our Editor had decided to report Council himself, we did not attend because of our professed interest in N.Z.U.S.A. affairs. Simply because we were working on the headquarters' staff at intermittent intervals, but mainly because we had just finished our freshman year and were not at that time brash enough to intrude upon the councils of the great; which is, surely, a reasonable enough feeling.

My reply to Mr. O'Brien's letter ends here with still much more to say; he will answer this briefly below, and further contributions in an epistolary form will be welcomed.

—T. H. HILL

PRESIDENT'S ANSWER

DEAR SIR—

1. I did not deny your right to criticise. I regarded your "attack" as unfair because of the inferences that could be drawn from it, and the specific allegations as unfair because they were untrue. I asked you to withdraw the allegations, not the "attack."

2. You have not attempted to justify the allegations. Your readers can best judge this issue.

3. True, you did not deny the merits of those selected, but you discussed the merits of your candidates, said nothing about the others, and left your readers to draw a number of derogatory inferences.

4. Since when has the revelation of total voting figures destroyed the secrecy of the ballot? Members' votes were and are completely secret from me or anyone else. It was my duty to get the total figures to see whether the motion then before the Exec was constitutionally justifiable.

5. When I write to Salient, there is no obligation on me to confer with other Exec members unless I claim to be representing their views. I, too, have a right to criticise.

6. Last August, the Exec agreed to a new policy of subsidising a reporter as part of the Tournament team. The Exec rescinded this when you became a Tournament competitor simply because you then automatically qualified for the same subsidy.

7. I sincerely apologise for my error in saying that you were Editor last Easter. It would have been more correct to call you the de facto editor. Shortly after Easter, I asked you, the Exec reporter, why you had not been at NZUSA. You did not then say that it was the Editor's job but merely replied: "Salient is the judge of what is news." I fail to see why an NZUSA meeting held in Wellington was not news when one held in Christchurch four months' later was.

J'ai fini.

Yours faithfully,

M. J. O'BRIEN, President

S.C.M. CONFERENCE

THE annual Summer Conference of the S.C.M. was held this year in ideal surroundings at Christ's College, Christchurch. About one-quarter of the 200-odd students who attended were from Victoria. The Conference centred around the theme of "The Evangelisation of the World in this Generation"—the old slogan of the World's Student Christian Federation.

The Rev. J. M. Bates, with his admirable combination of profundity and lucidity, gave a first rate series of Bible tutorials around the theme of "Mission." Evening speakers presented us with today's situation in mission fields at home and abroad. The position in New Zealand was dealt with by the Rev. M. W. Wilson, the Rev. I. H. Kaa and Miss Joan Metge, an Auckland S.C.M'er. The last two dealt with the situation among the Maori people and the seriousness of the present social and cultural position of the Maoris, particularly in the South Auckland area, was very keenly felt. It was recognised that it really was "a time of crisis and opportunity."

The Asian and the Pacific fields were also discussed by men who could give us a first hand picture of the sort of work a missionary today actually does. These fields can no longer be regarded as "overseas mission fields" in the way they were at the turn of the century; they are now centres of vigorous and independent branches of the Christian

Church, often strongly critical of some aspects of the gospel as it was preached to them by the Western Churches. Nevertheless, they still need men and women from the Western Church to assist them in specialised tasks. The links that we have with these Churches now must be maintained and strengthened. Another speaker who excited considerable discussion was Dr. D. O. Williams, of Trinity College, who spoke on the heading of "Frontiers of the Mind and Personality," treating evangelisation from a psychological angle. Dr. Williams' direct and informed approach to his subject stimulated our interest in many of the most immediate psychological problems, and both formal and informal discussions carried on for long afterwards.

The spirit of worship, which pervaded the ten days of the Conference, went hand in hand with the spirit of fellowship. Swimming, tennis, cricket, rowing on the Avon, square and Scottish dancing, squash and fives, all contributed to the fun of the Conference, together with, of course, the selection of Mr. and Miss S.C.M., the New Year's picnic and concert on Quail Island, and such things as the decoration of the sacrosanct dining hall with the Conference pyjamas.

Convention—the parliament of the Movement—met towards the end of Conference, and among the policy matters, it decided upon, was the setting up of a N.Z.S.C.M. Fellowship for past members of the Movement. Resolutions were also passed deploring the present state of New Zealand's immigration laws and urging the holding of a Christian Peace Conference. The Conference also sent a letter of greeting to other Christian movements throughout the world.

No S.C.M'er can afford to miss attending a Conference. The quality of its worship and fellowship and study make something which cannot be found anywhere else.

DINNER AND DRESS SUITS For Hire

Double and Single-breasted Dinner Suits 30/-

Capping will soon be here.

Get in early for the double-breasted suits.

PETER JACKSON LTD.

(Opposite G.P.O.)

WRITE FOR CAPPICADE

CONTRIBUTORS are urgently wanted for Cappicade Fiftythree to be published as usual this Capping day, May 8.

This year there is no particular theme for capping mag. The editors thought it would be much better if everyone was allowed to be just their plain, witty, funny, satiric selves.

Anybody who can write—or can't for that matter—should immediately face up to a typewriter (preferably, a good old pen will do) and bash out something simply hilarious.

If you don't want to, or can't write, you may have seen some ambiguous news headline, sentence, paragraph. Clip or copy it out, and add a corny comment or two.

But most of all we want the Big Stories—and quick, too.

Anything is good enough for Cappicade (just you look back and see). Anything we get will more than likely be published (unless it's perhaps twice as low as usual).

Your efforts should be written on one side of the paper only, with plenty of space between lines (double space if typewriting).

Parcel up the opi magna and dispatch it with the utmost promptitude to the commonroom letter-rack (male or female, strike out that which does not always apply) or to the Exec. room addressed to the editors, Cappicade.



By Ian Rich

My Six Convicts . . .

STANLEY KRAMER, the producer of such realistic films as "The Men" and "Home of the Brave," has brought us another that could have been of the same type, but, in fact, is not. This, I think, from the point of view of entertainment value, is a matter for rejoicing. I am thoroughly sick of Hollywood's mass production of "stark psychological dramas," with their self-conscious attempts to point a moral. "My Six Convicts" does succeed in making us think about what goes on in a prison, but only after we have laughed at the film's comedy. Perhaps it doesn't go far enough, perhaps it could have posed deeper problems. I don't know. Anyway the producers have decided not to take any risks and have taken the easy way out. This film is merely refreshing entertainment, unharmed by complicated psychology.

The director and actors play for laughs, and they get them. There are times, of course, when they all get serious-minded and give us gun-shootings and punch-fightings; but they are necessary and never really distract us from the comedy. And there are times when the fantasy goes too far, when the camera-work is too fussy and unobtrusive, when Dmitri Tiomkin's music score is too heavy and over-dramatic. At these times, I must admit, I was distracted (and slightly annoyed) but only to be won over again by the quality of the acting. It had to be good, if those six convicts were to be at all convincing. I can't mention them all, but they were all quite human, with their mixture of toughness and fundamental simplicity. Punch Pinero and James T. Connie appealed to me

THREE ENTERTAINMENTS

most, but all the performances, including the psychologist's, were equally as competent.

Not a great film as it might have been if its makers had been more courageous and less inclined to play for safety. But "My Six Convicts" could have been terribly dull.

Grading: ****.

Where's Charley? . . .

Who's Charley? With a certain amount of reluctance, I decided to go along to the St. James to find out. I was agreeably surprised, for I met a pleasant young Oxford undergraduate clowning, singing and dancing his way through a bright, broad and breezy musical adaptation of the famous "Charley's Aunt."

The setting of "Where's Charley?" is purposely theatrical, with painted-sky backdrops, black cardboard cloisters and artificial flowers. The technicolour is bright and the acting broad, in the light vaudeville manner. The songs are catchy and sung with zest. Naturally, there is a love interest but it is not heavy with emotional entanglements such as we usually associate with the Doris Days and Betty Grables of the more vulgar stage of other Hollywood musicals.

Ray Bolger (he was in "The Wizard of Oz") as Charley, is to be congratulated on bringing a smile to the face of a sour, often narrow-minded critic, who could have gone to town on the fact that "Where's Charley?" violates almost every rule of cinematic art. His charm and vigour, dancing skill and ability at mimicry made me forget all that.

Grading: ***(*).

Highly Dangerous . . .

"Highly Dangerous" is highly entertaining; and for the most part well made. Eric Ambler wrote the script and it is to him that we must give most of the credit. Cashing in on the current talk of germ warfare, he gives us a story of a female scientist who, in spite of a sinister chief of police, obtains

some specimens of a very special bacteria which a ruthless power is preparing to use as a weapon of war. That in a few words is the plot. Is it corny, is it conventional? I think most of us would say "Yes" and Eric Ambler realises this. With a clever twist, he turns his film into a satire, a parody of the type of film it could have been. The young heroine has a habit of listening to radio serials ("Will Conway be Saved?" "Tune in next week!") and, in the course of her secret mission, begins to have the same illusions as the serials' heroes. "Rusty, we must get through. Everything depends on us?" So she prepares a most fantastic plan and, of course, is successful. An ingenious script from a clever writer, but if the film is not entirely successful it is because it sometimes forgets that it is being satirical. It is often in danger of taking itself too seriously.

Margaret Lockwood and Dane Clark are adequate as the single-minded heroine and the "humorous" (of the "dry" variety) hero, while

the chief of police, Marius Goring ("Rumour has it that that chap had a mother") obviously knows his radio and screen villains backwards. The director, Roy Baker, also plays his part well, in spite of his use of such a trick as the camera slowly sweeping the whole length of a man's body; only to reveal that, after all, he is merely holding a revolver. But he did save the humour of the last sequence from straining to breaking point.

"Highly Dangerous" is superficial, but it did manage to entertain me. And as I was sitting in the second-to-front row, that is indeed praise.

Grading: ***(*).

The Devil Makes Three . . .

and the poor script, fantastic plot and non-compensating direction, makes six.

On the credit side, the use made of the war-torn city and the mountain scenery, Pier Angeli (only because of her looks) and Gene Kelly (only because of his charm).

Grading: ** (*).



WE were chatting to K.M. "Woof" Adams the other day. "Woof," who has a first class honours degree in mathematics, was remarking how hard it was for people in the arts to find jobs outside of teaching. It seemed to us that quite a number of prominent graduates are waiting around "for something to turn up." Colin Gordon, whose physics thesis is now being marked, is earning beer money on the wharves and by teaching at Tech. on Saturday mornings. "Woof" Adams, who (as you will remember) was the Returning Officer for the last elections, is intending to take radiophysics to qualify for the physics honours course.

The Army mob has returned from C.M.T. We noticed Eric Ofner, who was stationed at Fort Dorset; "Woof" Adams, who was a Don-R (dispatcher to the ignorant); Eric Bloomfield; and Dave Somerset, who is being talked of as the next Soc. Club secretary. Bryce Harland is still doing the officer's training course, as is Bill Loewenthal, the Taita and Hutt Valley cricketer.

We record with pleasure the birth of a son to L. B. "Pip" Piper, and Tilly Piper (nee Dewar)—all three are reported to be well.

Mr. F. L. Curtin, who is doing honours in law, also terminated his official connection with the Debating Society. It is whispered that he might be leaving Wellington some time this year. It seems that the stars of the Charter Club are quickly drifting away.

A fair young maiden has remarked to us that "Caf Chaff" is very conventional. This same young maiden does not realise the strife which would be let loose in varsity social circles if we were encouraged to become less conventional and perhaps more personal.

A young man was recently granted a commission in the R.A.F. A young lady was recently seen knitting a parachute of Air Force blue in English II. What does it all mean Judy?

We wish to amend our statement in the last issue crediting John Wright with seven years here. This is his fifth, and appears to be his last as he intends to sail to U.S.A. towards the end of the year where his plan is to work.

Jim Hogg sailed for England last Wednesday; on the wharf to farewell him were (among a large crowd) Miss Audrey Cook, David Horsley,

and Maurice O'Brien. Jim is to go to America after the Coronation to study law at the Harvard University Law School which is one of the best in the world.

In view of the recent publicity given to the cafeteria call-girl system in America it has been suggested by some home-sick Fulbright students that . . .



J. D. Milburn

The end of a great era in debating occurred on Friday night when Jim Milburn declined office in the Debating Club. During his eleven years' association with the club, Jim had held every position on the committee, had won nearly every major debating prize, and had been a member of the teams which defeated the Australian's in 1948 and the Americans in 1952. A vote of appreciation was moved by another prominent debating figure, the President of V.U.C.S.A., Mr. M. J. O'Brien, and carried by acclamation.

WRITE FOR CAPPICADE

Pour out your wit and satire for Cappicade this year. We are crying out for contributors (can't you hear us?). We want it quick. So write out that story, limerick, etc., and put it in the commonroom letter-rack or Exec. room addressed, "The Editors, Cappicade."

Buy your "SALIENT" Subscription and save money ONLY 5/-

ANOTHER CRITIC ANSWERS

DEAR Mr. Editor,—I should like to express my satisfaction with your film critic's appreciation of Chaplin's film "Limelight." An enormous amount could be written about this film in which nearly every incident has its particular significance and beauty.

One of Mr. Rich's remarks, however, may be misunderstood. Although it may be "easier to understand 'Limelight' . . . when it is analysed in its relation to Chaplin's total work," and while it is certainly true that a knowledge of his life and experiences as a film-maker add to "Limelight's" interest, it would be unfortunate to suggest that the film is not self-contained, and fully intelligible in itself. I wonder how many people after seeing and being disappointed with a film which has been highly recommended by critics, rather than ask themselves whether their disappointment arises from some deficiency in their mental or cultural education, have excused themselves with the plea of ignorance of film history, and especially of technical matters, which critics so often make so much of in talking of films, as though place in historical development, and photographic science, etc., were at the very foundation of the worth of a film. Many potential supporters of the film art must be frightened off by the average critic's fondness for terms such as panning, track shot, wipe, and fade. Similarly it is a mistake to say that adequate enjoyment of a film depends on knowledge of the director's past work, or the development of camera movement, or of experiments in editing, equally, that a film is great because it marks a considerable advance in some technical aspect of film-making. How otherwise to account for the reputation, for example, of "The Last Laugh"? All this is particularly relevant to "Limelight," for though Chaplin uses the camera, sound-tracks, his aesthetic sense, and most of all, the scissors, with superb effect, they are not used for their own

sake, merely to be arty, but as aids to saying what the artist wants to say. Chaplin gives his tools their due importance, but his interpretation of life and human nature is the core of his work.

In the latest issue of "Sight and Sound" a splendid informed appreciation of "Limelight" by Gavin Lambert appears. The magazine itself plumps for "Limelight" as the film of the year. So it seems that "Limelight" will not be everywhere "misunderstood and underrated." Yet it is true that many people who look down on the cinema will miss the opportunity of seeing a film which could alter their views about "the seventh art." Among them will be some of the cultural leaders of the community. The motion picture needs wider acceptance among such people whose opinions have some influence. They will be attracted to the cinema and persuaded to see the few good films that come to Wellington each year, most successfully by stressing that the best the cinema has to offer is as is the best of all art, concerned with the great realities and problems of life.

What follows is addressed to those diehards who persist in viewing the cinema with suspicion and disfavour, if you walk into the Public Library and pick up a book of which both the name and author are unknown, your chances of having a great book, even a good book, in your hand are very remote. Yet that is what many of you persist in doing in your choice of films. You go to a film knowing nothing of the director, script-writer or theme—and you come out of the theatre saying what a dull, childish, trivial, mercenary thing the motion picture is. You pass by films like "Bicycle Thieves," "The Long Voyage Home" and—"Limelight." You don't know what pleasure you are missing. But you have your chance. Mr. Rich can be relied on not to miss anything important. You do not have to share his views; merely go and see and form your own opinions about the films he marks with ***** and even ****(*) (except "The Sound Barrier"). You may make an exciting discovery.

—R. J. EDWARDS.



Boxing . . .

THE Boxing Club this year has in training one of the largest teams on record. Eliminations, both internal and against Massey will have to be fought before the final team is chosen and some good contests are foreseen.

In the heavyweight division we have a somewhat dubious starter in Neil Henderson. If, however, he does represent Vic. at Easter Tournament he will certainly give a good account of himself.

Bruce Carran, "the Brooklyn Bruiser," and Ian Fairburn are the Vic. contestants for the light-heavyweight position in the team. Both are possessors of a good reach and hard-hitting ability.

The middleweight division will be contested by "Gentleman" Jim Stirling and Pogo Ripley. Both are training hard and it should be a good contest to decide who will take final place in the team. The best of these two, however, will have to meet a Massey contender.

Our light middleweight is at present Jim Hutchison, known in fistic circles as "the Wadestown Wildcat." At the moment, by some stroke of luck, he is still on his feet, but he too will have to meet a man from Massey.

The welterweight place is being keenly contested by Peter Williams, "Mad" Mike Mayman and Paul Cullinane. Peter and Mike are both fit and shaping well, while Paul, though flaking periodically, is coming along nicely.

"Terrible" Ted Thomas will probably represent us in the light welter division and, on present form, should be able to hang several scalps on his belt. He will have to meet a Massey boxer in an elimination.

Peter Chatwin or Colin McMahon will fill the lightweight berth in a weight which is also being challenged by Massey. Both are fast on their feet and Peter, in particular, has a good left.

The featherweight representative will be "Battling" Barry Dunn who, if he were fit, could go quite a way.

Looking at it broadly, Victoria, though lacking in individual stars of the Bob Street calibre, has a team solid enough to win the Shield for the second year in succession.

TOURNAMENT FAREWELL DANCE

V.U.C.'s team for this year's Easter Tournament leaves on Wednesday the 1st of April. This year, for the first time the Tournament with Exec. delegates' approval are sponsoring a farewell dance for the team on Tuesday, March 31, after the ticket hand-out.

Freshers Welcome and Freshers Ball have both been a great success and Tournament Farewell bodes to be another social highlight.

Particulars are:—

- It will be held in that palatial night Club—the Upper Gym.

- Gay decorations, shaded lights, and the near proximity of the Woostones will provide a romantic setting.

S.C.M.

Sunday Service

LITTLE THEATRE

March 29, 4 p.m.

ALL WELCOME

Preacher: Rev. J. S. Somerville, M.C., M.A.

TEA TO FOLLOW

"SALIENT" requires your HELP

If you are interested in learning something about journalism, printing or merely who's who in the College, be at the Staff Meeting on

Monday, March 30th

AT 8 O'CLOCK IN SALIENT ROOM

All Welcome

{Supper !!!}

A MESSAGE TO THE TOURNAMENT TEAM

YOU have been chosen as the best this University can put into the field in the eight sports constituting Tournament competition.

Yours is not an easy lot for you have behind you the disappointments of the many immediately past years when Victoria has steadily won the wooden spoon and last year shared it with Canterbury. Yet the difference between victory and defeat is not great. In 1952 O.U. won with 30 points, V.U.C. was third equal with 22 points. A win then in only one more sport could have turned the tables.

It is up to you to ensure that you are at the peak of physical fitness and that you have practised sufficiently to fulfil your part well. Fitness and practice will carry close fought competitions. Every point and fraction of a point counts for the Shield we have missed from the glass showcase in our foyer since 1938. We appear to have excellent teams this year in Boxing, Cricket, Shooting and Tennis and the other teams are good, too.

The other side of Tournament—the social side is vital too. It is one of the few opportunities you will have to mix and fraternise with students of the other Universities and discuss everything under the sun. Don't be afraid to join in. Go to the Hops, on the scenic drive or to the picnic—be at the Ball and don't place too much stress on the Drinking Horn. Remember too the Aussies will be there.

Above all give your billetes a fair deal. Make sure you work in with them and offer to take them to one or two of the sporting events. Don't forget to tell them when you will be home for meals and don't arrive at 8 a.m. every morning after the dances.

Good luck!

P. D. CHATWIN,
Senior Tournament Delegate.

INTER-FAC SWIMMING SPORTS

ON Thursday, March 19, the inter-faculty swimming sports were held. These sports are the first to be held for several years. It is rumoured the last time was in 1948. Anyway the inter-faculty sports have been successfully revived.

A large crowd arrived at 8 o'clock ready to start punctually (?) at 8.30. There were enough entrants in each race to make it necessary for several heats in the freestyle and breaststroke event.

The night was cold but the tepid water of the Thorndon baths caused the competitors no hardship.

The Massey College competitors, Keir, McKenzie, Gay Simpson and Mary McWhannell are to be congratulated for coming so far to take part in the sports.

Controlling and organising the sports were Pip Piper and Dick Siddells. Officiating at the sports also were Professor Watson-Munro (club president and timekeeper), Mr. N. H. Gorrie (vice-president and starter), Mr. B. Hutchinson (judge), and Mr. Landreth (timekeeper).

The tentative tournament team which emerged from these sports is as follows: Women, captained by Miss Isabel Corkill (freestyle 100yds), Beverley English (dive and backstroke), Beverley Watkins (freestyle and medley), Susan Baird (backstroke), Gay Simpson, Massey, (backstroke and medley), and Mary McWhannell (50 freestyle and 100 breaststroke), Massey.

Men: Captained by Dick Siddells (breaststroke, polo), Ryalls (dive and medley), Dowse (breaststroke, polo), McPherson (freestyle), Ramson (backstroke, freestyle, polo), Steiner (already at O.U.) (freestyle, polo), McPharlane (backstroke, polo), Tan-

sey (freestyle), Fraser (polo). The selection committee regrets that because of circumstances L. C. Harlen cannot represent V.U.C. at the tournament. L. C. Harlen won the heat and final of the 100 freestyle in very fast time. He would have been an asset to the team.

The individual placings in the events were as follows:—

Womens 66yds freestyle: J. Comrie 1, 47 1-5sec; J. Thorpe 2; I. Corkill 3.

Womens 33 1-3yds breastroke: J. Comrie 1, 27 4-5sec; S. Blath 2; M. McWhannell 3.

Womens 33 1-3yds Backstroke: J. Thorpe 1, 30sec; B. English 2; G. Simpson (Massey) 3.

Womens 33 1-3yds freestyle: J. Comrie 1, 21 1-5sec; J. Thorpe 2; I. Corkill 3.

Womens dive: Comrie 1; English 2; Thorpe 3.

Womens polo: V.U.C. v Wellington Women: V.U.C. 3, Wellington 3.

Men's 100 freestyle: Harlen (L.C.) 1, 64sec; Cameron (L.C.) 2, Tansey (S) 3.

Men's 100 breastroke: Dowse (S) 1, 79 3-5sec; Smith (?) 2, Siddells 3.

Men's 100 medley: Piper (S) 1, 80 3-5sec; Cameron (L.C.) 2, Dowse (C) 3.

Men's 33 1-3 backstroke: Ramson (A) 1, 31 4-5sec; Keir (Massey) 2, McPharlane 3.

Men's 33 1-3 freestyle: Tansey (S) 1, 17 1-5sec; McPherson (A) 2, Cameron and Chisholm 3rd equal.

Men's dive: Murphy 1, McCann 2, Piper 3.

Men's polo: Science v Arts, Law, Commerce (S) 3, (A.L.C.) 3.

—JAMES HANNAN.

- The Senior Tournament Delegate has been given £21 by the Exec. to splash on arrangements so be along and get your moneys worth.

- That scintillating pianist Garth Young, jazzy drummer John Buchanan and Man Tucker with his clarinet will be on the ball.

- The Exec. will be there in force to enjoy the fun and the President will be asked to say a few words of exhortation and praise.

- The boys and girls with the big muscles will be there so come along and see young Venus and Adonis.

- Weir House will be along en bloc to study form.

- This will be an excellent opportunity to further that cemetery acquaintance, boys.

- Girls, make yourselves so attractive that he won't be able to resist you.

- A bang-on savoury supper will be provided with Coca Cola on tap.

- It will end when the last person leaves.

- The theme tune will be "You can't be fit as a fiddle when you're tight as a drum."

—P. D. Chatwin.

EXPRESS PHOTO STUDIO

217 LAMBTON QUAY

PORTRAITS
PARTIES

WEDDINGS
GROUPS

SPORTS

DOCUMENTS PHOTOGRAPHED

COMMERCIAL PHOTOGRAPHS

Candid Camera Work a Specialty.

MEN'S COMMON ROOM

SIR,—Might I suggest that the Exec. go down to a shooting gallery in the city and bring back some of those fascinating plaster animals to decorate the men's common room?

I dare not imagine what the new furniture will be like though the repainting promises something special. Having put down the wild aesthetes on his Exec. Mr. O'Brien has redecorated in the most decorous manner with cream ceiling and walls, very a-septic, a particularly nasty caramel skirting board, red linoleum which is in fact rather effective, and I gather, green (why?) curtains. Why choose such a banal combination? Unless of course, they are Mr. O'Brien's racing colours.

PATRICK HUTCHINGS.

Published for the Victoria University Students' Association and printed by Standard Press, 25a Marion Street, Wellington.