

THE GADFLY PAPERS

The Journal of the New Middle

Vol. II, No. 3

September 29, 1966

\$200 GRANTED TO RED BALLOON AS COUNCIL  
ELECTS NEW MANAGERS; BRAC REPORT  
HEARD; INSTITUTIONAL AND ADMISSIONS  
COMMITTEES ELECTED.

In an attempt to reorganize the Red Balloon (Bard's coffee house), Council heard a proposal from Councilman Steve Tremper. Mr. Tremper moved that Council accept the following proposal concerning the organizational and operating procedures of the Balloon: 1) That the Balloon become a Community owned coffee house.

2) That it should be directed by 3 managers.

3) That the managers be elected by the Council.

4) That this election be based on an acceptable academic rating designated by the Dean's office, and that the nominees have previous restaurant experience. Working for the Red Balloon for one semester would constitute such experience.

5) That tenure of the managers would be for one semester

6) That the managers be paid a salary of \$100 per semester.

7) That if a vacancy should appear the nominee would be selected by Council from a list submitted by the remaining managers.

8) That the managers be responsible for all forms of operating the Balloon vehicle. There would also be a 25¢

9) That the managers elect a treasurer and submit a list of weekly expenditures to Council.

10) That a inventory of equipment be submitted to the treasurer of Council.

11) That Council may have the power to remove any one or all of the managers for reasons of unacceptable management of the Red Balloon.

Councilman Grady asked if the Red Balloon needed a food license. The Dean said that it did not. Mr. Grady then asked if the Balloon would have to purchase any new equipment? Councilman Tremper said that the Balloon had the equipment already purchased.

Councilman McCune asked that in addition to the salaries, would Council make up any deficits? Chairman Krieger said that the initial \$200 should help to keep the Red Balloon afloat; but that Council would still be responsible for any deficit.

Councilman Edmonds wanted to know the duties of the managers. Mr. Krieger said that they would be responsible for anything that happens in that building.

Mr. Tremper explained that some of the duties included advertising,

shopping, and the gathering of talent.

Mr. Kreiger said that anything over the operating funds would be kept by the managers as profit. That this money would not go back to Council.

Mr. Tremper explained that people who worked for the Balloon would get paid out of these profits.

Mr. Kreiger said that "it would be left up to Council whether or not the initial \$200 would be in the form of a loan or a grant."

George Janto asked if the Red Balloon would be open for business this semester? Mr. Kreiger hoped it would be open in a few weeks.

The motion to accept the above listed operating procedures was passed 8-0-1.

Kip Eggert, Barbara Crane and Pauls Fuchs were elected managers of the Red Balloon. 7-0-2.

Miss Crane said that the Balloon would be open Tuesday, Thursday, Sunday, and Saturday nights when there was nothing else planned for that evening. She said that the

Balloon would not need the community vehicle. There would also be a 25¢ minimum charge. "This would be to prevent people from sitting around for three hours without buying anything", she said. Miss Crane added that B&G would be making the loft usable to enable the Balloon to accomodate more people.

Mr. Tremper moved that Council allot a \$200 grant with which to start the Red Balloon.

Councilman William Lensing asked if this would be paid back? Mr. Tremper said "no". Mr. Lensing then asked if this meant that Council would be laying out \$200 each semester? Mr. Kreiger said that it was left to the discretion of Council.

Mr. Tremper said that the \$200 would pay for the food stuff to be gin the semester.

Mr. Edmonds asked that since Council would be responsible for all deficits, why couldn't the \$200 be in the form of a loan?

Mr. Tremper said that each manager put in 30 hours a week or more. He said that he was in favor of making it an outright grant.

Mr. Jim Wine said that the initial outlay meant buying whol-

sale because it is cheaper.

Mr. McCune asked if there were any restrictions on how the money might be spent?

Mr. Kreiger said that it was for provisioning the Balloon.

Mr. McCune said that he wanted a more specific answer. He thought that some one, like the treasurer who is not involved with the running of the Balloon should approve all expenses.

Councilwoman Raphael offered an amendment to the motion. That a list be submitted to the treasurer describing what the \$200 would be spent on.

The amendment passed 8-0-0.

The motion passed 8-1-0.

Miss Ali on Raphael and Miss Arlene Krebs reported to Council on the activities of BRAC. Miss Raphael and Miss Krebs described BRAC's activities during the 1966 Summer project. BRAC set up an arts and crafts and dance program in Kingston. One of its members started a psychological testing program. BRAC was involved in the anti-poverty program and was instrumental in the initiation of a Child Care center and a Community center as well as a Legal Aid Society.

Miss Raphael said that BRAC was attempting to create a racial consciousness among the Negro youth in Kingston. BRAC is also trying to introduce the intellectual world to the unemployed and the poor.

Miss Arlene Krebs described how through close association with the children in Kingston who took part in the arts and crafts and dance programs, she and the other members of BRAC got involved with the children and young adults. Through BRAC's efforts a political and social consciousness was aroused in these children.

Council elected members to Institutional committee and Admissions committee. Tenure for Admissions committee is for 1 year. The members are: Andrew Gordon, Judith Arner, Rebecca Staples, Paul Schneider, Glenn Pomerance, Gary Bratman, Colette Barry, Robin Matteson.

Institutional Committee: Malcolm McCune, James Pollack, Anita McClellan, Nancy Livallo. Tenure is for 1 year.

The film club requested \$55.

Steve Horvath, speaking for the film club said that the club wanted to show the films twice, either once Friday and once Saturday night, or twice on Friday. It is hoped that by showing the films twice the problem of the crowds in Sottery Hall might be eased. Mr. Horvath explained that the money was to pay the projectionist for the extra hours.

Jeff Rochlis, a member of the budget committee asked if there would be additional charges from the rental agencies if the film club were to show the films twice? Mr. Horvath said that he had not checked with the film companies, but that there was no

no express stipulation limiting the number of showings.

Councilwoman Linda Boldt moved \$55 for the film club.

The motion passed 8-0-0.

Mr. Edmonds, chairman of the Safety Committee asked for some clarification of the uses and limitations of the community vehicle. He wanted to know who was entitled to use the bus and what were the qualifications Council had set for the drivers?

Mr. Kreiger said that each committee submitted a list of drivers to the Safety Committee. Any campus organization recognized by Council might use the bus. While BRAC and the Entertainment Committee both had transportation budgets, any organization might use the bus and be charged the standard fee of 10¢ a mile.

Mr. Kreiger announced that representatives of the different publications had met and had decided to send out order forms to the community. This way duplication and waste would be avoided.

Mr. Kreiger said that an agreement on a common publisher was being worked out.

Mr. McCune moved \$20 be granted to the Varsity club for an upper vs. lower college basketball game to take place Nov. 19th before the B.Y.O. The motion passed 9-0-0.

Mr. McCune announced that there was \$2,558 still unallotted in the Convocation fund.

Ilene Rosen

\* \* \* \* \*

QUOTED WITHOUT COMMENT:

"We've really been very fortunate until now. There hasn't been a fatality in the four years I've been here. At Dartmouth they average two a year."

Dean Harold Hodgkinson

\* \* \* \* \*

LETTERS TO THE EDITORS:

I am writing more to clarify BRAC's activities and the results of our first meeting, rather than to merely refute Mr. Holvenstot's letter and the other criticism leveled against BRAC in the September 22nd issue of The Gadfly Papers. Sarcasm is a convenient, but inadequate substitute for analysis. Unfortunately, the Gadfly has seen fit to publish sarcasm in place of satire and personal bias in place of concrete analysis. There is little that I can do, but try and ignore such criticism, for there is no possible way to refute that which has no basis in fact or logic. How would you like to deal

with a question such as, "What will Bard be like in 1984 when the Gadfly Papers becomes the only on campus publication?"

I do not wish to appear overly defensive to criticism. Actually, I believe that The Gadfly Papers could serve a vital role as a true gadfly to this community. However, there is little need for more gnats, particularly sectarian gnats. If either Mr. Holvenstot or the editors of The Gadfly wish to present meaningful criticism based upon careful analysis of BRAC's programs and the condition of Kingston, I think that you will find no more receptive audience than BRAC's membership.

However, the mere presentation of supposed "facts" does not represent valid criticism, as Mr. Holvenstot's letter clearly illustrates. Although he continually uses plural pronouns when expressing his own views, I have not spoken with a single person who agrees with his interpretation of what happened at BRAC's first open meeting. He was apparently present, but he understood little, if anything, that happened. His use of "quotations" out of context completely distorts their intended meaning.

One would have to be extremely pompous to believe that we "discovered Kingston." Actually the phrase was used to describe the discovery of an area with a major potential and need for community organizing located near the Bard community. Kingston was selected as a focal point for BRAC after it became clear that Tivoli and Red Hook were unsuitable locations for a major project. Kingston has existed for over two hundred years -- we could hardly discover it.

Next Mr. Holvenstot writes, "we were all so sorry to hear how through some sort of political intrigue the unemployed were wrested from BRAC." What was actually said was that due to the war in Vietnam, the unemployment rate in Kingston had dropped considerably. This is due to an increase in draftees among the poor, and the growth of the munitions industry in Kingston.

Next Mr. Hovenstot writes, "It was most edifying to hear of the trials of BRAC's people as they went along the streets of Kingston from diner to diner trying to be discriminated against." Mr. Holvenstot has distorted the meaning of that statement to the point where one would think that BRAC is made up of nazi's. Discrimination in the North is a very subtle and often latent problem. A diner owner may not discriminate against a person who he knows is a civil rights worker, but he may practice discrimination against other negroes. He may serve black people, but only after making them wait for twenty minutes. Miss Krebs (BRAC) went with two people from the ghetto into a diner that they knew had practiced discrimination so that legal remedies could be taken under the state and national civil rights

laws. Mr. Holvenstot then writes "There was no doubt in any of us that black history and arts and crafts will be of incalculable value to the people of Kingston in preparing them for an active role in our society." In that Mr. Holvenstot enjoys using plural pronouns I think it safe to say that he means his society rather than our society. In any case he certainly does not refer to their society. Society need not belong to middle class white youths exclusively. It is not our intention to prepare people for an active role in Mr. Holvenstot's society. If he wished to discuss the theoretical significance of cultural and historical awareness among black people in America, I would welcome such a discussion. However, more than sarcasm is needed for meaningful dialogue.

Finally Mr. Holvenstot writes, ". . . we were glad to hear that although BRAC's efforts at political organization were 'a total failure' the Community Council is big about giving money and is doubtless when compared to BRAC's other challenges 'not that much of a hurdle.'" This last statement is a total distortion of what was said at the meeting. First, we did not say that community organizing was "a complete failure." Both Alison Raphael and I referred to our Urban Renewal program as a complete failure at the meeting. We also explained why it was a failure in that it proved impossible to involve many people from the area directly against Urban Renewal, hence an organization could not be built around this issue. Most people felt that there was just no way to make the Kingston Urban Renewal Agency fulfill its obligations to them, and there was just nothing that they could do to change things. A number of people in BRAC including Alison and I, worked quite hard on Urban Renewal and we did manage to create a few changes. However neither of us is in anyway satisfied with the present Urban Renewal project and what is more important neither are the people who live in the project area.

We then discussed our relationship with the Bard Community as a whole and Community Council. Someone then expressed optimism that Council was not, and would not become antagonistic towards BRAC. There was general agreement that Council was not a hurdle, nor was it an obstacle that had to be overcome. I believe that most of the Bard Community generally supports BRAC. Certainly I believe that most people agree that we have the same right to carry out our programs as have the other clubs and organizations at Bard. However, we agreed at the meeting that BRAC could do more to keep the community informed of our programs and their results. BRAC's programs have been

extremely rewarding both personally and socially. They have served a positive social function both at Bard and in Kingston. However, we must continue to make our goals and objectives clear to this community.

This is indeed a new semester, but the problems that our society faces are not new. Summer has not brought the Great Society. BRAC has never pretended to be able to solve all of the problems that exist in this nation, or even in Kingston. With some help we may be able to make a few changes that will lead to a more humane life for everyone. This help does not exclude criticism; but it must be a positive criticism based upon a knowledge of the situation.

Sincerely,  
Guy Farrell  
BRAC

\* \* \* \* \*

To the Editors of the Gadfly:

I am writing in reply to last week's "Miscellany" column. What the editors stated about the Bard Racial Action Committee was irrelevant and consequentially ineffectual. The "issues" Mr. Mortimer and Miss Rosen raise, in their hopes of becoming controversial, outspoken "New Middle" critics are so irresponsible that the editors have degraded both their personal integrity, hence the worth of their opinion. I hold criticism that is valid and constructive in esteem; I have no patience for criticism which is without any sound basis and without any relation to actuality.

The Community Council Bus and BRAC's budget are the Gadfly's perennial complaints. "Why does BRAC get a transportation allowance when no one else does?" It happens that the only other group which requested a bus transportation allotment was the Entertainment Committee which received the funds. The Gadfly's criticism of our receiving \$901 from Community Convocation has no value, unless they are able to criticize the way the money is spent. I have never once seen anyone from the Gadfly or other BRAC critics come into Kingston, personally review the situation, and write objectively about it. Critics must familiarize themselves with BRAC's programs, before they can offer us any valuable alternatives.

As for the thought provoking 1970 projections, I am amazed how the editors spend their time thinking of levels on which to attack us. I had thought Mr. Mortimer and Miss Rosen knew more intellectually constructive attitudes to adopt towards BRAC, or at least find more relevant things to say. As it stands, BRAC membership is larger than it has ever been. Indeed, we are one of the largest

working groups on campus. There are 27 people tutoring, 9 in Arts and Crafts, 3 for Dance, 5 for Music, and 11 for Community organizing.

I am disturbed about the low quality articles you are publishing. I am disturbed not because they will damage BRAC (I believe in the integrity of the student body; I believe in BRAC) but because I cannot imagine two college Seniors, American History majors, coming off with such ridiculous "sensationalism" in the hopes of becoming the controversial opposition. Personally, I don't consider your means of attack to be of much worth. You present very little intellectual challenge.

Respectfully yours,  
Arlene Krebs  
BRAC

\* \* \* \* \*

A REPLY FROM THE EDITORS . . . .

\* \* \* \* \*

Thank you Mr. Farrell for your lengthy letter, the entirety of which appears above, and you, Miss Krebs, for your acrid harangue on the editor of this publication. Criticisms of our criticism are always welcome; and, I can assure you, are given thoughtful consideration.

With regard to your letters, I think that a word or two in reply to your criticism is in order.

Firstly, Miss Rosen and Mr. Mortimer have never "hoped" to be controversial; their very presence at this college makes them so. You might say they've got "guts" -- they say what they think, and with a good deal of vehemence, too. This seeming audacity which expresses itself in the medium of "a Gadfly", conflicts with the general temper of Bard -- a curious blend of solipsistic aloneness and hipster conformity. At Bard, more outspokenness is controversial, no matter in what vein or through what spokesman.

Secondly, you object to our criticism of BRAC because it has "no basis in logic or fact." I contend that it does. It is a fact that at Council's first meeting Alison Raphael, sounding much like little orphan Annie, requested a sum of money for purposes which she could neither adequately explain nor specifically itemize. Now BRAC received a healthy budget last semester in addition to a "summer project" allocation. BRAC's sense of financial responsibility, we must deduce, and I believe this is logically arrived at, lies seriously in question.

But this leads me to my final point. "You present very little intellectual challenge"; says Miss Krebs. Has BRAC ever provided this student body with an intellectual challenge; and by this I mean, a

challenge devoid of irrational emotionalism? We hear of only programs and more programs for the "oppressed" of the Kingston "ghetto." Have you ever framed your sense of mission within the context of the Kingston "situation"? That is, have you ever objectively outlined to this student body the circumstances which compel you to action.

Understandably, the rejoinder to this criticism is, "I have never seen anyone from the Gadfly or other BRAC critics come into Kingston." Now really Mr. Farrell and Miss Krebs, you must see our position in this matter. We are students, and we feel that the proper focus of "intellectual challenge" (to use your term) is in the academy. We can't come to Kingston. You'll have to bring Kingston to us in the manner outlined above -- through clear, unbiased presentation of the Kingston situation. Then you might look for intelligent, constructive criticism.

BRAC has become exceedingly bourgeois in these last months. Why? Because it feels "established." It defends its requests for exorbitant monetary allocations behind that old cloak of conscience and moral righteousness. George Babbitt would have trouble outdoing you. BRAC can go before Council and for a tear walk away with one hundred bucks. In short, Mr. Farrell and Miss Krebs, if you deal with this college intelligently so will you be treated in the same manner.

Sincerely,  
John Faylor

\* \* \* \* \*

To The Editors:

Being a transfer student to Bard, I can look with a certain touching unbiasedness at such stirring issues as the Great BRAC Fracas, and, since I live off campus - the Dirty Dorm Scandal, which also fails to raise my ire.

However, if the "Gadfly" can get off BRAC's back, for a moment, there is a need for stinging elsewhere.

Now, to get to the issue of Bard publications (present company excepted) - What about the Bard "Observer"?

Yes, indeed, what about the "Observer"? Can this really be the official, printed, regularly distributed publication of a small liberal arts college one hundred miles from New York City?

If yes, why does it bear such a remarkable resemblance, in form and content, to the Podunk PTA Weekly?

- The layout - disastrous
- The content - unbelievable
- The headlining - moronic
- The total effect - appalling

Surely among the six hundred or so students here - one was editor of his high school newspaper; one has taken a course in elementary journalism; one can write decent editorial prose.

This being the case, why is the staff of the paper composed of, what I can only imagine, are members of the custodial staff?

M. K. Schulman

\* \* \* \* \*

To The Editors:

Perhaps your column of miscellaneous questions ought to have included a few about the Library. For instance, why doesn't it open until 2 o'clock on Sundays? Those of us who live in outlying dorms (e.g., Blithewood, the Manor, Robbins) have found that this leaves a huge bloc of wasted time between the end of breakfast and 2 P.M. (for addition to leaving us stranding during the cold months or on days of inclement weather).

Some hearsay has it that the reason for late opening is the lack of funds to maintain a staff on Sunday mornings. If the Library were to open at 11 AM, the total cost of one student librarian would be three dollars (above the present operating cost). We're reasonably sure that the College can obtain this sum for such a worthy cause.

An additional question: Why are the floors of the third and fifth level galleries constructed of harsh and grating clanging metal? These are certainly not conducive to contemplation and study.

Finally, what and why is the official policy as to the use of the Library phone (front desk)? It is a great inconvenience to have to beg and plead for the use of it, in order not to have to make the time consuming journey to the nearest dorm or the Coffee Shop - while the Library has two phones, each carrying both out-going and incoming calls.

Jane Forman  
Barry Fructer

\* \* \* \* \*

To The Editors:

Although proposals for reform vary with the winds, no one at Bard defends the status quo. The administration finds it too unstructured; the faculty finds it too unscholarly; and the students rail against the last vestiges of official or social restraint on the uninhibited expression of their creative talents. All defend stalwartly prerogatives against the encroachments of other departments of the college. Yet all feel frustrated by a system which they themselves compose. This is an untoward situation and cries out for correction. This article will attempt to do that.

What is the problem with Bard? At one level of analysis it is certainly a lack of conflict. This is more serious than it sounds; for conflict implies values and courage, precisely the two most potent antidotes for Bard's personal and moral nihilism. If you do not claim to have values that you attain and maintain maturely, how can you possibly claim to have a self before the external world that even the most subjective, solipsist must acknowledge? If your 'values' are merely surrogates for unexpressed emotions you need a good dictionary. Let us give an illustration, as well as a partial explanation.

tion of, this lack of values.

By ignoring reality and the values necessary to cope with it, Bard students vitiate the point of their own happiness; even their awkward gestures lose meaning. The artificial gestures of Barddom only make sense by their contrast to the conventional modes of acting in the bourgeois society that Bard students come from (almost invariably). Your smoking pot becomes like your mother's social drinking, avant-garde movies replace country clubs where staid people react in pre-determined ways to cliches. Bard behavior becomes an extension of insufficiently comprehended high school behavior.

Granted the above, how is the Bard student to learn about reality and the tools necessary to cope with it? There are four possible alternatives in the present system - field period, courses, other students, and extracurricular activities. We shall consider their efficacy.

Field period would seem the ideal opportunity for encountering reality. It seems not to achieve this object. It is too brief to be a truly sobering experience, and it weakens the potentialities of other vacation periods by shortening them. One cannot escape long enough from the torpor of Bard moral oblivion.

What about Bard's still strong teaching staff? Can they provide all the awareness and testing of values that Bard students desperately need? Alas, no. For most Bard students are still at the level of development where their psychological whims govern their ideas and not vice versa. One has a chance to teach fifteen students in two hours; he cannot hope to administer psychotherapy.

Could contact with other Bard students provide much help? If they know what is coming off, the problem would eradicate itself.

Partly as a result of Bard's size, extracurricular activities do much less than they should to promote awareness. The 'student body' lack drive or any comprehension of structure, anything that implies value and leads to conflict. No, the system seems unlikely to cure itself.

Must we then chuck all of Bard and Bardness? Must we abandon all of the idiosyncracies that we have grown to love and depend on? Can no surgery save the Sick Old Man of the Hudson?

One way would be to encourage Bard students to get even more contact with the real world than they can get on their frequent jaunts to the City. This can be done in two simple ways: relocating the college closer to a major town or city or by making Bard an all-boys school so the social life would be more extroverted. Moving Bard College would be very messy and expensive and would cause it to abandon an exceedingly attractive campus. Eliminating girls would force the school to give up a majority of its brighter students. Surely, though, there is another solution short of dynamite.

There is! Not only is it rational, humane, and original; but it accords with the Bard ethos by being progressive, unusual, and obvious. The college should require that all present Bard students take off one calendar year preferably before their freshman year. Since the Bard environment goes little to encourage students to assume responsibilities -

the most effective way for most people to mature, Bard students should be compelled to encounter for a considerable length of time an environment where responsibility rears its well-trimmed head. Since the Dean allows us to stay here, we know that we are not 'excessively sick.' We can survive reality.

"Aren't you being opinionate, old-fashioned, intolerant, uncharitable, unfair, and nasty?" No. Let's face it. Bard demands too much of the high-school graduate. Then it isolates him so as to lessen the chances of his learning effective patterns of coping with his freedom. An enforced year off might be just the maturing catalyst that would make Bard the outstanding college it still has the potential to become.

Frank Dobbs

\* \* \* \* \*

Letter to the Editors:

Not only is smoking a heartbreakingly beautiful habit, but one that has given mankind a reason, a goal, a purpose, a signal, a reason for being.

Why are people at Bard so humane? Profound? Ceremonious? Is it because they are painfully realizing their existence through smoking - as they struggle, smoke-like, through the tobacco leaves of life? And what makes the intellectual calibre of conversation in classes and at Adolf's stimulating, searching, intoxicating - so much more so than in the Dining Commons? Because you can't smoke your food! The ritual of smoking is too delicate, too precious a thing to combine with the animal necessity of gorging. That is why human beings were made so that they could not do both at once. And the fact that the lower animals can -- or could, if they knew how to smoke -- is one of the most important distinctions of man and beast. I am happy to announce that there is no tragic misunderstanding of the meaning of smoking as is the case with many of the other fine arts. That is, the very symbolic, and often ancient motions of the smoker have not been left to be laid aside, forgotten and ridiculed. On the contrary, smoking is a living art, it's always symbolic and often very ancient motions are in the process of being constantly invented by highly conscious and sensitive smoking artists. If you smoke, you cannot help being creative, since you cannot avoid creating smoke, and are continuously exciting the emotions of those around you in your own novel and individual ways.

( to be continued

Majorie Tomkins next week)

\* \* \* \* \*

NEEDED: One bright, observant society page editor to cover activities of new social circle on campus called the "Tweedies" and who hold their parties in the Zimmerman Room of Ward Manor. Must be well-dressed and clean shaven. Inquire with editors.

\* \* \* \* \*

All letters to the Gadfly may be addressed to the editors: Ilene Rosen, Jeffrey Mortimer, and John Faylor.