

The Knothole

11-13-1963

The Knothole, November 13, 1963

SUNY College of Environmental Science and Forestry Student Body

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.esf.edu/knothole>

 Part of the [Communication Commons](#), [Creative Writing Commons](#), and the [Environmental Studies Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

SUNY College of Environmental Science and Forestry Student Body, "The Knothole, November 13, 1963" (1963). *The Knothole*. Book 54.

<http://digitalcommons.esf.edu/knothole/54>

This Newspaper is brought to you for free and open access by Digital Commons @ ESF. It has been accepted for inclusion in The Knothole by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ ESF. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@esf.edu.

Handwritten notes:
use for a date entry
if we already have one then
Handwritten initials: *AB*

CAMPUS AS SEEN THROUGH THE KNOTHOLE



Editors: R. Bathrick, J. Dwyer, M. Kelly, R. Kutty, H. Rupp, R. Sena

November 13, 1963 Deadline for Entries: Monday 8:45 A.M. Published by Alpha Xi Sigma

FURTHER COMMENTS ON APATHY

The general topic for this year's Student Leaders Conference was student apathy. Isn't there just as much apathy, however, among certain faculty members as there is among certain students? Can the apathy evident on our campus, if there is any at all, be attributed entirely to the students?

Every student puts each professor from whom he has had a course into a particular classification. In the usual case, this classification is done by whether the professor is an easy or hard marker. Can not the professors be classified, however, as to whether they have an interest in their course material or are merely carrying through the motions of teaching because they lack the drive and initiative to survive in industry?

The professor who has an interest in his particular field and also in teaching does not have to be concerned about attendance at his lectures. His lectures are stimulating and open new fields of thought to the student instead of having the student memorize insignificant facts which were up-to-date ten years ago. The exams administered by this type of professor do not call for memorization of facts which can be found in reference books; but, instead, requires an understanding of the basic concepts and an application of these concepts to specific questions.

This instructor's counterpart is one who attempts to impress the class with what he feels is his well diversified knowledge. As for his lectures, he takes the easier way out and lectures from a book containing the material, with no

adaption or additions of his own. His exams consist of regurgitation of his lecture notes by the students; a test of how quickly and thoroughly the student can memorize the material, only to forget it next week.

I do not mean to imply there is a tremendous amount of faculty apathy existent in the faculty of our College. The majority of the professors with whom I have had an acquaintance fall into the first category. There are, however, a few apathetic faculty members as well as apathetic students, but these are far outnumbered by the members who have an interest in the activities and traditions of the College.

M. Kelly

WHAT DID YOU EVER DO?

The school was desolate and quiet. A whole week had gone like this and then we finally returned. I'm speaking, of course, of the absence of the landscape architects who have recently returned from the annual jaunt to see their profession in action.

The Junior Class visited various places of interest in New York State, including professional offices and jobs that have been done in the past. Highlights of the trip usually include places such as Bear Mountain and James Baird State Parks, various subdivisions, Vassar College and the developments around Sterling Forest. The several IBM centers visited are always refreshing especially the commanding building at Saarinen in Yorktown. The church architecture in Stamford, Connecticut is quite beautiful.

The Senior Class hustled down to Philadelphia on Monday to visit with the Eastern Office of Design and Construction of the National Park Service and to see the contemporary developments and historical restorations going on there. The majority of the trip (five days) was spent in Washington, D.C., where we saw the effect of L'Enfant's monumental plan first-hand. We learned of the abuses the plan had gone through and then spent several hours with the District of Columbia Land Redevelopment Agency seeing how planning is restoring the old scheme. In Washington, we were in the midst of a vibrant problem: that of planning for the future and taking care of the housing and relocation of people at the same time. It was quite exciting to see that it is possible to do a good job in urban planning - improving the city while doing the least amount of harm to the people directly effected. We also saw numerous offices, talked with many people in our field, and visited old gardens such as Dumbarton Oaks and those in Georgetown.

After getting home on Sunday, we prepared for a new week of classes. The trips were tiring and hectic but well worth it for the information gained.

R. Sena

Dear Editor:

In light of the two replies to my letter concerning Mr. Welch's speech, I feel that I must again submit an opinion on this matter. All the following will be, in fact, my opinion.

In response to R. K.

1. Where have I implied that the people of New York State are "basically ignorant"? Nowhere.
2. I mentioned "forester", not "professional forester".
3. I have not been here two years, but about 15 months.
4. Where did I say that I was speaking for "the foresters of the state"? Nowhere.
5. If everybody who disagrees with you leaves this state, do you realize that this would leave everything to your group. I understand this might not be a democracy. You might be left all alone, too.
6. Just who is supposed to be a "God", disputing the Gods, and in favor of the Gods?
7. I believe that you could find many foresters in the field and office who advocate forest management in the preserve. I am trying to enlighten people to "my" side of the article in question. Just who is being foolish in "withholding" information from the public? The preservationists and myself certainly have offered both sides of the argument. Could it be that you are the foolish one for deporting anyone who offers an opinion that differs from your own?
8. Are you scared to sign your full name so people can readily identify the author of that tremendous letter?

Before I wrote this I talked to several interested parties and it is of their opinion, and mine, that your reply was a garbled, confusing mess.

And:

In answer to Mr. Zebuhr's letter:

1. He wrote of the dead "deer", good, but did our speaker elaborate on the slide to make it clear just what it was?
2. I like his opinion on the deer food-cover argument, though I was offered a counter argument by a student (disputing Zebuhr's opinion) that was advanced to him, allegedly, by a faculty member. How about a statement from the wildlife management department?
3. If Mr. Zebuhr wishes to have "some group" control his property, (timber-wise), I believe that there are countries in the world today where this is possible; perhaps in the Soviet Union or Red China?
4. When one attacks a cause, or preservationism, I should think it would be necessary to start with something, be it an individual or group.

I would like to thank Mr. Zebuhr for his intelligent reply; perhaps this is a direction toward ridding our school of this so-called apathy that is rumored to be present. To learn well, one should defend his views, and hear those of others. R. K.'s opinion is the classic one; like it or get out. I should like to know the man who offered this great humanitarian viewpoint.

Now I should like to hear a decent argument to counter my previous opinion, offering some definite information, not just a garbled complaint.

Would the wildlife department possibly issue a statement on the deer problem in question?

Foresters, ordinary and professional, work for and with the public; these men should be ready and willing to offer advice and opinions, with some reservations of course, and we should always have the guts to sign our name.

.... Let not these arguments get out of hand and become ridiculous in everybody's mind. Rather stimulate interest and discussion with varied topics... any ideas that we could "discuss" from anyone? I have several:

1. Make summer camp more of a "working camp" with reasonably intensive training in, say, bulldozer, truck, and saw usage. Be more selective in which majors go to which camp.
2. Are certain courses really necessary and valuable to the student?
3. On preparing for a forestry career, could recent graduates with both pro and con advice talk during convocation?
4. How about a series of talks on pertinent subjects to "clear the air" on facts and fancy; examples could be the Preserve, employment in the West versus the East (forestry), being self-employed in the forestry game, etc.
5. A talk on a timber company's business policies might be very beneficial.
6. How about a factual report on a timber consultant's annual salary versus some of these high daily cruise pay rates I heard at summer camp?

Russ Deming

AN ANSWER TO MR. DEMING

My congratulations to you for the keen insight you possess that has allowed you to read so much into three paragraphs of garbled, confused mess. Taking your objections one by one I would like to make the following points.

1. You asked where you have implied that the people of New York State are ignorant. A look at the last paragraph of your original letter might well show us where. I quote you.

"I listen to too many people, who have never seen the Adirondacks, attacking forestry, or have you forgotten that the logger is also a forester, because some soul told him, or his wife at the garden club meeting, that this forestry kills their pretty deer, and on and on."

This clear and concise piece of literature seems to be saying that the average person or his garden clubbing wife does not have the intelligence to weed fact from fancy.

2. You say that you mentioned forester and not professional forester, but to me and most people at this College, forester means professional forester.

3. In regard to the fifteen months versus two years situation, I take back the extra nine months of intelligence that I gave you credit for.

4. Again, the confusion in your fourth point lies in the definition of a forester. If a forester is a bulldozer operator, as the end of your article leads us to believe, then my interpretation is way out of line.

5. I did not say that everyone who disagrees with me should get out of the state. What I did say was that anyone who confines his activities to personal attacks on the opposition rather than coming up with convincing ideas for his own cause might better leave the state.

6. I define a God as anyone who feels his views are so right that the views of the opposition should not be heard. You fit this definition when you implied that we should not have been subjected to Mr. Welch's biased talk.

7. Apparently in your point seven, you decide that forester and professional forester are synonymous and most certainly I must agree that a good portion (if not a majority) of the professional foresters advocate management on the preserve. You then say your article was an attempt to enlighten the people to your side of the issue, and this is false. Quoting directly from your original letter you say, "Perhaps this seems like a poison attack on an individual or an organization, it is". That does not sound like an objective piece of enlightenment to me.

8. Finally, I did not sign the article R. K. because I was afraid to reveal my name. In the past, it has been the policy of many "Knothole" editors to sign only their initials as the editors names are listed in the "Knothole" masthead. In this case, R. K. stands for Raymond Kutty, co-editor of the "Knothole" and senior in wildlife management.

That concludes my answers to your attack. This has not been an attempt to answer any of your questions concerning the preserve but was instead a defense of your attacks on Mr. Welch and myself. If you would refrain from personal attacks in the future, you will give myself or others time to answer some of the questions you pose.

R. K.

MOOSEWOOD'S NOTEBOOK
#22

A British entomologist once remarked about his taxonomist colleagues, "The trouble with those fellows is that they spend too much time floundering amid the multitudinous meticulousities of nomenclatorialism!"

And who is "Moosewood"? For the edification of newcomers, he is Dr. William M. Harlow, senior author of "Textbook of Dendrology", faculty member 1928-56. Presently, part-time film producer for the College.

BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES DIVISION OPEN HOUSE

The Biological Sciences Division of the College, composed of the Departments of Botany and Pathology, Entomology and Zoology will conduct an open house for Freshmen on Thursday evening, November 14th, at 7:00 P.M. All interested students should assemble in Room 326, Marshall Hall to hear brief summaries of career opportunities in the various fields of biology. Following this, students will be free to visit facilities and talk with faculty and graduate students in the various departments as they wish.

FILMS

Any citizen of the State may borrow at no charge (except Moisture in Wood) these films for group showing. Contact the Extension Department.

<u>Date of Release</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Running Time Min.</u>	<u>Owner</u>
1952	Time-lapse Studies of Growing Trees	9:10	State Univ. Coll. Forestry
1955	Tree Portraits (Golden Reel Award; Film Council of America)	22	" " " "
1958	New Horizons for Wood	28:30	" " " "
1958	From Wood Fibers to Paper (1960 Certificate; Amer. Film Festival)	21:	" " " "
1960	The Challenge of Forestry in New York State	21:30	" " " "
1961	Wood Decay by Fungi (1962 Certificate; Amer. Film Festival)	20:13	" " " "
1962	Forestry College (1963 Cert.; Amer. Film Festival)	29:20	" " " "
1963	Introduction to Forest Adventuring (in collaboration with Fay Welch)	26:30	" " " "
1963	The Mechanism of Moisture Movement in Wood (Co-producer, Dr. Christen Skaar)	30	Produced under a grant from the National Science Foundation. Distr. by N.Y.S. College of Forestry Rental \$5, purchase \$125

FORESTRY TAKES TWO AT QUEENS

This past weekend, Vox Silvae, the College's debate team participated in the intercollegiate debate tournament at Queens College, Long Island. There were forty-one Eastern schools present including West Point, Navy, Union, Colgate, Coast Guard Academy and LeMoyne College.

There were four rounds of debate of which the Negative team won two. Robert (Rusty) Bryant as first speaker and John Doane, second speaker, downed Mount St. Vincent and Wagner. This, the first judged tournament of the year, showed a particular improvement in Bryant's scores over last year.

The Affirmative team, though much improved over Colgate, failed to win any rounds. The most apparent weakness was clarity and presentation, which will improve with time.

The total win-loss record for Forestry then was 2 wins for 6 losses. Some other schools were: West Point 2-6; Colgate 1-7; University of Buffalo 3-5; Howard 5-3; Rutgers 4-4; SUNY at Albany 2-6; SUNY at Brockport 1-7; Villanova 4-4.

Trophies for best Negative team went to Seaton Hall with 4-0 and a total of 159 points out of a possible 200 points. The best Affirmative team was Navy, also with a 4-0 record for 183 points. The best schools were: Dartmouth at third place with a 7-1 record for a total of 281 points out of 400; LeMoyne College in second place with 306 points; and with an unbelievable 8 wins and 0 loss record for a total of 336 points was Seaton Hall.

Our next scheduled tournament is at the University of Rochester in the early part of December. During the interim the team will be drilling on practice and improving the quality of evidence.

FORESTRY WIVES ASSOCIATION

In conjunction with the "Society of American Foresters" meetings in Atlanta, Georgia in 1962, the "National Association of Forestry Students' Wives" was formed.

During the 1963 meetings held in Boston in October of this year, the State University of New York College of Forestry at Syracuse University, was enrolled as a charter member of the N.A.F.S.W.

The S.U.N.Y. College of Forestry has the distinction of having the largest number of married students in all the Forestry colleges embraced by the national organization, and hence, the charter on our campus also has the largest number of members.

At the November meeting of the group, the officers for the year were elected, and plans for a Christmas party for the married students and their wives are well under way.

The group holds its meeting on the first Tuesday of the month at 8:00 P.M. in Marshall Hall Lounge. Wives of foresters are cordially invited.

For further information, those interested can contact the president, Nancy McLelan at 476-0002 or the secretary, Janet Dean at 476-1078.