Leftovers enough to last the next two months

As the name implies, this column tries to cram in all the bits and pieces that are left over from any issue, and since this is the last issue of the year, we are trying to cram in all the bits and pieces that are left over from all year long. One small bit we would like to comment on, in our dying breath, is the SUB art gallery.

Throughout the year, these pages have offered what we feel to have been consistently constructive criticism of the gallery and the shows they have exhibited. Until last week, we felt that the gallery was steadily improving, but it now appears that we were sadly de-

The disillusionment came after an unfortunate incident, which, we admit, could have been avoided. The incident itself is unimportant, but it did serve to uncover some disappointing attitudes of the art committee. We refer to holier-than-thou, art for We refer to the sake, temple is as temple does, attitude of an art gallery which regards art to be the sacrosanct product of an Artist/Creator/God.

We must apologise to the reading public, whom we have led to believe that galleries are for people, and art is something you relate to. It now seems that to the Students' Union, and in particular, to the art committee, it is another

icon, to be placed on another pedastel.

These pages have been visited frequently by members of Art committee, officially and unofficially asking for publicity, and expressing their desire that the student body come to see their exhibits. We in turn have given them as much space and cooperation as possible. However, if they sincerely wish a larger response from the public, we suggest that they try cooperating with the students, in making the gallery a more enjoyable and accessible

Your response, dear hearts, to our article last week on Henry Stelfox's When the Sawflies Mate in Summer and Other Alberta was so gratifying that we have decided to give you a second taste of the Soulful Agrarian. Here is one of his more interesting "Lament of the Great White Bull":

Take me not to the home farm,

Daddy,
Where little girls can swing on
my tail and say horrible things

But take be back to the Tay ranch, Daddy; Where I can lie down in valleys,

where cool fresh waters flows; And rest in the shade of the big diamond willows

Where pea-vine and vetch luxuriatly grow.

So that I may range the hills and mountains sides in the springtime,

When nothing worse than mountain lions and grizzly bears bother me.

Often I dream that I hear a big

bull elk bugling,
Then I bugle the challenge of
the big white bull;

Only, alas, to wake up and find that I have been dreaming, And find a little girl named Helen giving my tail a big

Oh, I'm pining away for the Tay

ranch, Daddy;
Those wide open fields, the hills
and the dells,
For a sight of the rivers and
snow-capped mountains,
Where grass is so sweet, where

no little girl dwells. Just turn me loose, Daddy, from your barn in the village,

I can find my way back to the Tay river ranch.

Let me saunter along to my friends west of Ricinus, I'm longing for a sight of Buck, Hattie and Tan.

I don't want to tell tales of a little girl teasing me,
Though she called me this morning "a big hunk cheese".

And sometimes she tells me that I'm a homely old lobster, And she bet me a dime that I'm covered with fleas.

Oh, thank you Daddy, Right now I'll be leaving, I'll amble along, bugling my

I can now paw the ground and

bugle merrily; If you come to the Tay river this summer

Just bring Helen along.

Whatever one may think of the lepressingly dingy interior of SUB, externally it is the most impressive building on campus. That tall black tower is perfectly balanced by the long sweep of the white south facade.

Well, someone has screwed it all Someone has decided that SUB is not quite distinctive enough, that it cannot be recognived. Somone has slapped a big black label over the main tentry.

Marilyn, that's not what it's all about.

Lassie eats chickens-i.e. we have observed from bitter experience that there is a crying need for natural order in this world. As we tumble through metaphysical chaos, and a sort of euthanasial phenomenalism, there is a continuing fight for some sort of acceptable support structure in our lives (Playtex, Maidenform, etc.), which alas is a losing one.

The end of the year is of course drawing near, and soon you will be without the moral and esthetic fore, before we leave you, we would like to present our public with a few humble signposts to indicate the direction of the beckoning light.

The following simple questions (easy even for Kanklewits) will show you, dear hearts and gentle readers, if you are eligible to register a mark on the great existential calendar in the sky.

1. What is your position on intercourse? Novelty counts here, but honesty counts more.

2. What ever happened to Baby Jane? Never mind Baby Jane, Never mind Baby Jane. what about Doc and Snake Eyes? If you know, score half the remittance

3. Did you vote no for arts rep? If you answer yes, score five for thought, but subtract ten for being

screwed up and paradoxical,
4. Have you got a light? Score

5. Have you got the light? Score one hundred and ninety three.

6. Was Yorick a head? For a yes, score ten and go to jail.7. Has it ever occured to you?

8. Does the crosstown bus run all night long? Doodah, doodah.
9. How would you react to:

a. a golden goose

mating sawflies in summer "What do you think you are-

the third duke of Bedford? d. none of the above

10. Cross your heart and hope to die. Do you? Score ten for reality. 11. Are you the African Queen? Are you a queen? What a drag.

Score three. 12. Who said Nevermore? Never mind who said nevermore, who said never mind? Subtract three

Films

The Zefferelli Romeo and Juliet (at the Paramount) turns out to be superb. Better than Shakespeare, in fact.

The Shakespearean play, after all, as Bernard Shaw pointed out some time ago, is a hymn to a peculiarly debilitating form of romantic love.

Who can take seriously, or find humandecent, the world-well-lost-for-love idiocy we must accept here if the play's finale is to work properly? Yet who can hold back from the seductive magic of early Shakespearean language?

Anybody who finds the task of making a Shakespearean film suddenly on his

hands, that's who.

The usual problem, in fact, with Shakespearean films is that the visual clashes with the audial; a style, after all, developed to render scenery unnecessary consorts oddly wit the super-scenery the big screen needs to fill it.

What always happens is that the text gets hatcheted; and, since the mature Shakespeare, for all his faults, was more talented than most film-writers, an improverishment results.

But the peculiar nature of Romeo and Juliet is such that the hatchet-job for once lets the play breathe, reveals proportions in the play I can't see emerging from an uncut performance.

Hack out most of the lover's speeches, and you eliminate the romantic-love rot. You are left with the situation of the lovers, which is something else again. Juliet's youth suddenly makes dramatic sense, as does Romeo's folly.

The ironies can grow now; the lovers become the young counterparts of those magnificent oldies Antony and Cleopatra. The play becomes the definitive tragedy of immaturity-as-irresponsibility-as-pathos (A & C being maturity-as-irresponsibilityas-splendor).

And something even stranger happens. With the lovers devalued, the "center" of the play gutted, the periphery comes into

Zefferelli gives us a Romeo and Juliet the power of which derives from its vision

of a town on the edge of chaos, of the breakdown of civil order and a consequent casual brutality.

The film is brooded over by the Prince of Verona, whose infinitely sad face restores precarious order twice only to end raised over the dead bodies of the lovers as he cries "We are all punishèd" to the stunned, repentant town.

The other unexpected emergence is Mercutio's

Zefferelli has had the bright idea, appalling on paper, of turning Mercutio into a highly nervous homosexual whose pranks flow forth from dark anxious depths; his Queen Mab speech becomes a writhing mouthing of his sexual horror.

Amazingly enough, the trick works; and the balances within the play are immeasurably enriched by this new com-

Zefferelli's usual virtues are on display too, of course. The color is scrumptious; the handling of the crowd scenes im-

But the outstanding feature of the film is not, as in his Taming of the Shrew, decoration. Rather it is the large-scale structural intelligence the film displays, which leaves one feeling the size of the play to be not all that much less than that of the great middle-period tragedies.

This column will be my last in these parts for some time, so one valedictory thank you may not be amiss.

My greatest debt as critic has been to the Edmonton Film Society, which over the last five years has done an amazing job of providing us with those fine films our shmucky commercial theatres won't go out on a limb for.

Without the Society, becoming cinematically literate in Edmonton would not have been possible. It's as simple as that.

And so, faithful following, dauntless devotees, adieu. Mr. Westgage reigns supreme in lonely eminence again as the pen drops from the exhausted hand of your faithful servant,

John Thompson

