In Pursuit of Daniel P. Moynihan
by Robert Morgen

In studying the social history of late nineteenth-century America it is somewhat surprising to note the smugness with which the laissez-faire philosophy is defended. One would get the impression that the Puritan ethic and social Darwinism represented immutable, eternal truths, subject to no qualification. Three quarters of a century later we are somewhat hard put to find articulate defenders of "rugged individualism." Another social philosophy has taken its place, however, and its defenders are every bit as uncompromising and unbending. The new philosophy is the one which attributes everything to society. If John Roe fails to achieve the success of John Doe, there must be no attribution of individual differences; society is to blame.

The foregoing may help us to understand the reaction that has been afforded to Daniel Patrick Moynihan. Moynihan is now back in teaching. Only last year, however, he was the center of much controversy as a result of the memorandum to the President which was leaked to the press. Even this controversy, though, was nothing when compared with the outcry which greeted his paper on the Negro family. Several critics have called Moynihan a renegade liberal--as if this was enough to damn him everlastingly. The contention of this article is that the sharp criticism of Moynihan derives from the fact that he has challenged and upset various shibboleths that many liberals
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"The law alone can give us liberty"
- Goethe

A Calvin Coolidge Society Editorial:
Robert F. Wagner
for President

Endorsing Robert F. Wagner, the former Mayor of New York City, as a candidate for the presidency may appear to some as a farce or a satire. After all, the man is not a Puritan running for the office, and even if he were, his ethic and social philosophy is defended. One farce or a satire. After all, the man is not a Puritan running for the office, and even if he were, his ethic and social philosophy is defended.

We believe that this choice is especially reasonable in the light of the fact that his successor as Mayor of New York City, Mayor Lindsay, is considered a serious candidate for the presidency. Now Mayor Lindsay has an excellent public image, an ideal face for television, and a rhetorical style that sends liberal editorialists into tremors of ecstasy. We ask, however, what he has accomplished in the office he now occupies. After a short investigation, one will find that most of what he has done since assuming office falls on the negative side. Transit fares have steadily risen while transit service has steadily deteriorated, and light snowfalls again and again have paralyzed the city. What is more important is that the city has been plagued by strikes of transit employees and various groups of public employees, especially schoolteachers and men of the sanitation department. To offset this evidence one might say that he has not displeased the people of New York City that much, for he has been elected to his office twice. We say, however, that in
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both elections his opponents made the mistake of putting up the most banal candidates possible, and even against them Lindsay did not score that impressively. It will also be noticed in this connection that Lindsay's standing in the popularity polls is inversely proportional to the distance of these polls from New York City.

Robert F. Wagner, in contrast, lacks a lustrous image and a dynamic rhetorical style. However, he demonstrated that he knew how to administer the city from day to day. For example, while he was in office, the transit employees would present their usual exorbitant demands every two years. Thus, both parties would move out of the public eye, discuss contract terms on a very pragmatic basis, and come out with a settlement. And, throughout these encounters transit fares never rose. In these instances Robert F. Wagner demonstrated that he possesses an ability necessary to a

"The Negro Family: The Case for National Action" was written in 1965. The paper remains an outstanding example of social science research. Unlike gurus such as Reich or Illich, who merely assert their case and expect us to acquiesce as a result, Moynihan thoroughly documents and supports his argument. Among his supporting evidence is the work of the outstanding black sociologist, E. Franklin Frazier. Moynihan's basic thesis was that three centuries of intense racism and exploitation has had a significant deleterious effect on the Negro family. The black family, Moynihan reported, has been so weakened that even if racism and inequality disappeared tomorrow its members would not be equipped to take advantage of their opportunity. The effects of this weakness have shown up most of all in the urban milieu.

Discussion of Moynihan's points certainly was in order. Yet a large part of the criticism that greeted his report was truly astounding. Intimations were voiced to the effect that Moynihan was indulging in a form of subtle racism. This is surely a surprise to someone who has read the report, since he would have found nothing like that in it, for the simple reason that it is not there.
public official, that of dealing on pragmatic terms with those who share power with him. If it is conceivable to consider John V. Lindsay, who conspicuously lacks this ability and virtually all other administrative talents as a presidential candidate, then it is quite reasonable to heartily recommend Robert F. Wagner for the office that demands even more administrative ability than running New York City.

Apparently, those who support John V. Lindsay for the presidency have forgotten the lesson of 1960. At that time there was another handsome, affable, magnanimous sounding political figure on the scene, John F. Kennedy. When he became president he brought tremendous style, wit, grace, and elegant rhetoric to the White House. The only problem with him was that he was a dreadful president. While he was running for office he excoriated the Eisenhower administration for having an overly tight budget. One of his acts as president to remedy this ill was to increase the military budget stupendously. He had also complained that the Eisenhower defense policy was too inflexible. To solve this problem he authorized the training of various special forces, the existence of which made it possible for America to march on to new frontiers like Vietnam. In fact, it was John F. Kennedy who made the firm, irrevocable commitment to defend the Saigon government against so-called invaders from the north. In contrast to these policies, one might contend, John F. Kennedy favored much beneficial social legislation, for instance, Medicare. This point appears valid. However, he found it impossible to push any of these programs through Congress. It seems that John F. Kennedy, despite six years in the House of Representatives and eight years in the Senate, had no sense of Congressional politics. It took the crafty politician Lyndon Johnson to get Congress to pass this legislation.

Nowhere in the report is there the faintest intimation that blacks are genetically inferior to whites. Moynihan has not anywhere said that the cause of the Negro's present plight lies in the weaknesses of the Negro himself; he could not have been more explicit in saying that the present weakness of the black family is the result of racism. As a matter of fact, we may well ask how Moynihan is upsetting a dearly cherished shibboleth, since he is saying that the weak black family structure has been brought about by society, and that society must work to remedy the situation. The point where Moynihan challenges the liberal notion of "society," I think, is his recognition that the entire social process is composed of both society and the individual. Society has indeed weakened the Negro family. In turn, however, the affected family structure reinforces stereotypes that society has about the black man.
Many of Moynihan’s critics argued that his interest was in the wrong area: he should have been concerned with unemployment and discrimination rather than with the family. Aside from the fact that Moynihan obviously was concerned with unemployment and discrimination, we may well ask whether his view of the entire problem is not more profound as well as more correct.
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Soviet Union. In the cases of both John F. Kennedy and John V. Lindsay it is interesting to note that liberal commentators, who plead so eloquently for effective governmental action in so many fields, so often favor politicians who are very long on high-flown rhetoric and very short on positive accomplishments.

This adulation of appealing rhetoric is not the exclusive property of liberals. One notes this propensity to an intensified degree with numerous elements of the student left. Various of these constantly plead for a real, fundamental solution of the ills of this society, but seldom come through with anything but rhetoric. Frequently these persons form groups on campus to help in carrying out their aims. The activities of these, however, are usually restricted to inviting speakers from off campus to provide yet more insipid rhetoric. When these forces are finally moved to action, they take over school buildings. This form of action is really dealing with the problems of our society at their sources, and is bound to bring on the expected socio-political millennium.

Then there is the apolitical left, consisting of the members of the counter culture. A mercurial law professor says that they will cure the long-standing ills of humanity, and many of them even agree with this prediction. When one checks to see what this force is doing to bring about this end, he will find that its adherents are producing a lot of interesting talk.

While this manner of rhetoric, dream-making, and misdirected action continues, it is to be hoped that sound, practical men like Robert F. Wagner keep things running and in order. In this way life will go on with or without the passionate intensity of those with far-away looks in their eyes.

- Richard Harding
What Moynihan is saying is that centuries of racism have taken their toll on both the black individual and the black family. What Moynihan's critics, including civil rights leaders, are saying, incredible as it sounds, is that racism has had no injurious effects on the black man. Thus the argument that the "social and economic system" were overhauled, there would be no more problem.

Surely we must view the opinion that examines only the "system" as quite naive. After the depredations of the Nazis against Jewish life in Poland, for example, it would be foolish to expect the pre-1939 situation to reassert itself immediately after the Nazis were defeated (Moynihan indeed compares the system of slavery with the concentration camps). Or, to cite another example, if a child has suffered severe emotional damage on account of his environment, we would hardly expect the damage to totally disappear the moment a healthy environment was supplied. On the contrary, we would probably prescribe several years of therapy. The situation in the case of black people is unlikely to be any different; Moynihan's position in this matter would seem to be almost the only one that a non-racist could hold.

Moynihan is perceptive enough to see that racism in America has begun to break down. The situation in 1965 or 1971, when compared with 1920, for example, shows only slight improvement in certain areas, but extraordinary gains in others. The disquieting fact, as Moynihan has realized, is that as racial discrimination eases, the situation of a large segment of blacks is getting worse, not better.

Moynihan has shown himself to be equally perceptive in his controversial memo to President Nixon. At the time the contents of this memo were leaked the press ruthlessly distorted Moynihan's intent by taking the phrase "benign neglect" completely out of its context. It can be argued that the phrase was an unfortunate one; but this could be said about any phrase that is pulled out of context. What Moynihan was saying, of course, was that hysterics and rhetoric will not help the black man and therefore they should be played down. It should be noted that the man who was counselling "benign neglect" was at the same time advocating the Family Assistance Plan, one of the most radical ideas ever put forth in America for the purposes of helping the poor.

In a New York Times interview this past summer Moynihan displayed the same trenchant mind that he had shown on former occasions. Once again he destroyed pet shibboleths (the notion of "moral leadership" for example) and asked just the right questions. He wisely pointed out that before we rush off in all directions it might be a good idea to examine the failures of the sixties: why did the decade begin with
such promise and end with the republic on
the point of instability? Daniel P. Moynihan has been a particularly useful figure
in our public life. We could use more per-
sons like him who are ready to study the
importance of both the individual and
society.

The following talk was given by
President Kline on Parental Day

"Your presence here today is part of
the College's essential life and being.
For without parents there would be no
students and no college. And without your
sons and daughters who are here with us,
you would have no bridge to the future. As
far as your children are concerned you
embody the past, and as far as you are
concerned, they are the most important
element of the future.

"A college is a crossroads, a place of
meeting. It is a meeting of past and future,
a meeting of a world with thousands and
millions of years of history, and a world
just being born.

"It is an easily observed fact that the
way of life of the young is different from
that of their elders. For a time, people
said this was 'just a phase,' -- a passing
fad. But I think we are seeing something
more basic and more durable than that.
The young don't just dress differently and
have their own music and patterns of
speech. The community of youth is marked
by different values and a different view of
life. And time is on the side of the young
when their values are at variance with
those of their elders. Their numbers
grow, and the number of their elders
diminishes. They move into and eventually
take over the adult society. The young
rebels of the early 1960's now constitute a
sizeable segment of college faculties.

"What are the marks of the youth culture,
of the new society, as we encounter it on
a college campus?

"First, it sees life in individual person-
to-person terms rather than viewing the

individual as a unit of society. There is
therefore less tendency than formerly to
fit one's behavior to a system, to force
a person to act against his desires or in-
terests, lest by a single individual's
flouting the system, the whole be destroyed.

"Second is the conviction that the goals of
education are the development of one's own
role and the creative expression of one's
own feelings and experience, rather than
the mastering of verbal summaries of the
race's past experience.

"Third is a new respect for and openness
about the natural instincts and processes
of life. Herein lie the roots of new sexual
standards, of the mounting concern for the
environment, and even the fast-spreading
student fondness for animals and for the
keeping of pets, and a vegetarianism which
can see meat-eating as embodying the
moral reprehensibility of cannibalism or
murder.

"Fourth, the youth culture sees the
structure of forceful constraints which
society erects against destructive behav-
ior as being often more dangerous than
the threats those structures were set up to
control. Hence the young tend to be anti-
police and anti-war. Many will doubt
whether men can live harmoniously with-
out the traditional order-keeping machi-
neries. But one must admit that by their
stubborn stand here, the young of the world
have come a considerable way toward mak-
ing war inoperable as an instrument of
national policy.

"The life to be found in college is marked
by a fierce insistence on its own values.
It is powerfully affecting the adult culture,
and at times beginning to take over that
culture. It holds high promise and moves
amongst great dangers.

"And yet, this is what it means to be
alive in 1971, to be young in 1971, to face
the future in 1971. And for those of us
involved in colleges, this is the business
we are in.
"I don't have to be convinced that there are more horse's asses than there are horses."
John L. Horton

I seldom, if ever, afford any attention to the speeches of Presidents (Washington, Jefferson, Nixon or Kline), however I recently chanced upon the October issue of "The President's Message" (Bard's newsletter for Mom and Dad), and, quite unexpectedly, found the contents to be dull. Deceivingly dull, though. For sandwiched between news of semin... and art shows, there lay the transcript of President Kline's address of that marvelously traditional occasion, Parents' Day. Having forgotten to bring along my notebook that day, one can easily imagine my ecstasy at the discovery of such a gem. As I read the words, my mind raced back in a fever-pitched rapture of nostalgia, to the scene of the event, appropriately enough, in the Bard gymnasium. Ah, sweet aroma of nostalgia!

There was much good sense and logic in that speech, such as: "For without parents there would be no students..." Quite a revelation. And without Bard College, there would be no President Kline, and there would be no necessity for a President Kline. That is, of course, all very hypothetical. Bard College does exist and President Kline is a necessity. Isn't he? Of course. Anyone with or without a brain in their head recognizes necessity. Holy mother of invention! President Kline serves a vital, though primarily titular, function. Where would Bard College be without President Kline? Where would Comet be without Josephine the Plumber?

But as I re-read the scripture, my orgasm of nostalgia gave way to nagging doubt, of substantially greater potency. I felt a faint but incessant tugging at my lower extremity, as I once more sifted those sands of pseudo-sagacity. Mayor Lindsay himself never wrestled with a larger snow job. And I was reminded of the eloquent solution proposed by Jimmy Breslin for the problem of snow removal in New York City: "Piss on it!"

My metaphorical responsibility was crystal clear.

One could well re-title President Kline's address as "The Greening of Bard." The fundamental difference between this composition and its namesake is that Charles Reich's wallet underwent a greening of no mean sum, in tribute to his whitewash. President Kline does not figure to gross nearly as much.

We are, once again, presented here with the typically enlightened presentation of youth subculture, and subcultural it most certainly is.

President Kline cites as "easily observed," the difference in lifestyles between the youth of today and their elders. He is correct in this statement: the difference is an observable one; but he is incorrect in the assumption of any depth in this apparent dissimilarity. The disparity is a superficial one, at best. This fact is not easily observed, but it is easily deduced.

True, their view of life is different from their parents'. They have no constraining responsibilities here at Bard; no obligations of absolute necessity. They are housed and fed and they are insulated from that fabled world of the outside, even more so than in those idyllic years of High School. For now they have escaped the bane of their home life, accursed be that world, even more so than in those years of High School. Mayor Whyet my mouf' an' raise my consciousness! (cont. on reverse side)
Yes, President Kline, this generation does embody a different set of values, if absence of respect for one's fellows may be considered something new and different. Yes, they dress simply and spend their money on dope instead. And money is of no concern to these children of Marx, as long as they've got enough of it to keep themselves gratified. If they run out they can always go home for the weekend and endure the rigors of their family lives, so that Dad will keep the brand coming. Anybody need a ride to Scaredale?

President Kline plods on with his pearls of wisdom, as he informs us: "The young rebels of the early 1960's now constitute a sizeable segment of college faculties."

That's right, these purveyors of radical politics trade their jeans in at Brooks Brothers and slip right into the system, fulfilling the mundane dream they've professed to despise. Rebels, indeed.

Now we get to the good part, as the President outlines the tenets of this new society. We are told that this system views the individual as much, rather than a "unit of society." "There is therefore less tendency than formerly to fit one's behavior to a system..." That is supposed, refers to the wide diversity in styles of dress and the highly developed forms of speech and communication which this wonder culture embraces.

Diversity extends to a question of the particular brand of jeans you wear, and just how long your hair is. Language exhibits beautiful and intensely descriptive phrases: "Far out!" "Heavy!" and "What a bummer!" And let us not delete from this list that cornerstone of knowledge upon which this generation was weaned: television. It is remarkable that a generation insensitized to violence by this media should come out so adamantly against war.

This anti-war involvement is another point of commendation in this address. It has been, most assuredly, a movement of highly honorable and humane intent. But where is the voice of that movement now? The strength of any culture must lie in the ability to sustain its values and effect a practical application of those beliefs upon which it stands. How commendable can we deem any movement which lacks the sustenance to maintain itself at least, until the accomplishment of its initial objective? Belief or profession of belief in a given ideal is not enough. Perseverance and accomplishment are the only criteria by which we can judge the validity of a moral code.

President Kline seems convinced that the primary object of education is the development of creative expression.

In the first place, I find it interesting that the educational experience here at Bard is not aimed toward this end. It has been my experience that the development here at Bard puts great emphasis on a scholarly, tradition oriented approach as the measure of a "successful" student. There have been departures from this, but projects like the Inner College represent the antithesis of a practically organized scheme of education. They are an excuse for education: a sham of substitution, not a solution to the difficulties of tradition-orientation.

Neither can traditional education be labelled "the mastering of verbal summaries of the race's past experience," as President Kline so adroitly labels it. If an examination of Plato or Homer can be considered a "mastering of verbal summaries," I shudder to imagine what our definition of education has become. If education does not draw upon the vast resources of past experience and culture, wherein lies its basis? Any study of present experience carries little meaning in its own context, without the benefit of some historic perspective.

An emphasis on the creative expression of feelings and experience is, by itself,
meaningless. The mere expression of
experience is not beautiful nor artistic;
nor does it serve a necessarily valuable
purpose in terms of communication. The
danger here is the fact that this expression
is too often taken for art, a dangerous as-
sumption indeed. A concept and recogni-
tion of art is not instinctive, but a matter
of trained perception. Today we witness
the fruits of this exclusively creative
emphasis: an increasing number of self-
styled "artists" whose art is typified by
verses of sloppy, self-indulgent poetry.

Art for artist's sake: a representative
sampling of that middle class ethic of self-
gratification. "Getting into" oneself is an
effective rationalization for extreme
egozentrrism.

After all, what can I learn from Tolstoy
that I don't know already? I mean, be rele-
vant, man.

I intend to do justice to this master-
piece, so bear with me as I complete my
task. The worst is yet to come.

Totally abandoning any remote semblance
of logic, President Kline starts talking
about "new sexual standards," etc., etc.
These new sexual standards might best be
described as morality dictated by conven-
tience. Yes, birth control certainly does
liberate.

Just who is kidding whom here? Is it
President Kline kidding us, or President
Kline kidding himself?

And what portrait of these socialist
saints would be complete without reference
to their concern over ecology and love of
animals?

You see, all these kids from the scenic,
pollution-free metropolitan area come up
to Bard and worry about pollution. They
scream about recycling paper while they
throw their slop around dining commons.

They worry about the air they're
breathing while they park the parking
lots, and catch rides to New York
City every weekend, and book them
home Monday morning, transformed
into their true organic inner selves.
Can you dig it?

If you want evidence of their
deepest affection for animals, take a
trip to Bard over Field Period.
You can count all the cute dead
man and women friendly dogs starve. It's
nothing to get upset over,
though. They were starved.

People have always kept pets in
this country. The only difference
being that formerly, people gener-
ally made a conscious effort to keep
their animals healthy and alive.

Now, what, oh President Kline?

Well, enough of this. It is
certainly difficult any subject lacking
interest, and it's hard to teach.
I wouldn't want to take my students
down this unexplored path of
sexually-based morality.
Laughter is the sexiest
pleasure life has to offer, so
look while you can, President Kline.

I have not meant any of this as
a vindictive diatribe against Our
Beloved President. I harbor no
personal animosity for the man,
having never spoken with him
personally.

I would welcome the opportunity,
for I have been told he is a man of
compassion. I have also heard
that he plays an exceptional game
of chess. This confuses me, for if
a man can play chess, he can cer-
tainly think. I suppose some of
his allies must be college presi-
dents, and others are gifted at
 chess. I hope the causal who
were at both.

It President Kline, I offer this
advice: stick to chess.

Peace Brothers.
Letters

To The Editors:

Robert Morgan writes in the November, 1971 issue of The Utopian that, "The race to uniformity at Bard is also helped along mightily by an administration that places such a low priority on diversity that it allows the student body to become more monolithic with every passing year." As far as the supposed priorities of the administration are concerned, this statement is simply not true.

As I am sure that Mr. Morgan would not want the administration to impose political or other attitudinal tests for admission to the College, I assume that he has in mind admissions policies that would secure greater diversity in socio-economic backgrounds and in academic interests. With regard to these forms of diversity, I would offer the following observations:

1. Since I have been at Bard, we have begun a Higher Education Opportunity Program that for the first time has brought to the College a substantial number of students from economically disadvantaged backgrounds. We have also increased dramatically the number of black and Latin American students at Bard.

2. At the present time, the most serious problem of lack of diversity at Bard is the absence here of students from working class backgrounds in anything like the proportion of their numbers to the total college age population in this country. Everyone that I know of in the administration is deeply troubled by this gap in our student population. Not only because it constitutes an inexcusable example of economic and educational injustice, but also because it deprives the Bard community of a very significant strain of attitudes (including Bard academic work) and opinions present in the larger society. The only reason working class students are not admitted to Bard in larger numbers is their inability to pay the full cost of a Bard education; and, therefore, the administration is now working very actively to try to develop additional sources of financial support for them—probably from State funds of one kind or another.

3. I have personally argued on many occasions that some of the unfortunate aspects of student self-selection for Bard could be avoided by placing greater emphasis on recruiting students from parts of the country in which there are fewer good liberal arts colleges than is the case in the Northeast, and where Bard's reputation in certain academic and artistic areas would not be such a limiting factor in terms of the students who would apply. However, the College, and, consequently, the Admissions Office has been under...
might take several years to produce a significant number of applications. In view of these facts, I can only conclude that Mr. Morgen made his statement about administration priorities without really caring very much whether it was true or not. This is rather unlike Mr. Morgen's usual work as a writer, and I am disturbed to think that he may have thought it justified simply as a way to "stir" administrators into writing for The Utopian: I had had always thought that it was one of the cardinal (and more agreeable) principles of conservatism that one group of people should not attempt to manipulate the behavior of others. Next time, why not just ask us to write?

Sincerely,

(signed) Carl M. Selinger
Dean of the College

Mr. Morgen replies:

Dean Selinger makes some interesting points in his letter. Let me reply to his last point first. It is certainly true that I have been interested in stimulating discussion and controversy, feeling that they represent a healthier state of affairs than does general apathy. The Dean is a bit foolish, however, to suggest that I purposely distorted the facts in order to produce argument. In other words, any error in my article was completely unintentional.

I am aware of and highly approve the effort to recruit minority group students. The fact is, however, that these students still represent a very small percentage of the Bard student body. I believe that my statement remains valid concerning the overwhelming percentage of students that are not from minority groups. In particular I was addressing myself to the situation which could elicit a comment from a Bard professor that "the trouble with you students is that your views are all similar. You don't have an opposition." I was commenting on a condition where, as a study which the Dean was kind enough to let me see revealed, 95%, 77%, and even, in some cases, 100% of the students had the same opinion on a particular subject. This is homogeneity with a vengeance.

The Dean says, echoing the usual liberal position, that the situation would be vastly improved if "only we had the money." I believe that this is only partially true. Not all working class students have views that are different from those of Bard students, and not all upper-middle class students have views that are the same. Incidentally, not all black and Latin-American students have views that are different from the Bard majority, either. Class background plays a part in this issue, to be sure, but it is not the whole story.

The case of the Episcopalian students throws an interesting light on the whole issue of diversity. Now I hardly need to say that I do not mean that Bard should become a predominately "churchy" school, for if it did become that it would once again be monolithic. Nonetheless, the active recruitment of these students in the early sixties added to the total diversity at Bard. Money could not have been the determining factor, for there was even less of it than there is now. The reason for the abandonment of this recruitment would, I think, shed as much light on the whole situation as a look at the economic picture.

Situation (Hypo) Critical

While at a Women's Liberation symposium I heard one of the speakers state that the reason she liked Bard so much was because Bard was (cont. on p.12, col.1)
so different from the school where she taught. She said that at that particular school "all of the students were either drunk or stoned all the time" and they hated anything new or different, i.e., radical programs, etc., but at Bard it was different. It is my belief that if she spent some time here she would see for herself that Bard students are no different than anyone else, perhaps they are worse because they pretend to be different, and this pretension often becomes hypocrisy.

Bard students walk away about the EVILS OF CAPITALISM but voice no objection when dad, who is making $40,000 a year sends them to Europe for the summer, buys them a car, buys them a stereo, buys them records, buys them clothes and gives them huge amounts of money to spend.

A subject of much talk on campus is ECOLOGY. Everybody claims they are for ecology. The truth is that no one really gives a damn. Blame for the ecological mess the world is in is usually laid on "Big Business." That huge factories wreak havoc on the environment cannot be denied. There is no big business at Bard but the next time you leave dining commons look around you, it is a pig sty. It is a small effort to pick up your tray and clean up after yourself but a great majority are just too lazy and are just plain middle class slobs used to having Mom clean up after them. Everyone is for ecology and conservation but look at the way the field at Ward Manor is ruined by people too lazy to drive around so they make a new road right through the middle of the field. I once asked if the college could put up a fence but was told that that would be fascist. Well, it is my view that if people need a fence to tell them where to drive and where not to drive then fascist or not put it up. Everyone is for conservation but look at the way animals are treated at Bard. Most are starving mangy creatures. (The animals in India live better). Few take the time to teach their dogs anything or even feed them. As a consequence they roam around dining commons begging food. For Christ's sake if you're going to have a dog, take care of it. Cats have it harder than dogs because they are easier to ignore. Any discussion of the poor treatment cats receive here would be otiose. At the end of each semester there are always a bunch of animals left behind. In the winter they simply freeze to death and die, in the summer the sheriff has to shoot the starving dogs that are attacking Mrs. Bozwick's goats.

The amount of thievery at Bard would put pirates and highwaymen to shame. Each year dining commons loses $6,000 in dishes and silver ware, the library loses a slightly greater amount in books and records. How about thefts between students? Rooms are broken into, car trunks smashed open, clothing stolen--the list can go on. The bookstore at Bard is robbed right and left. What Bard Student can't afford a book?

(cont. p. 13, c. 1)
Basic Training

- by William Lottes

(Second in a series)

Alas, the morning of departure comes. You get dressed in your nicest clothes and pack your shaving gear, etc. Now the long ride to the airport (the last mile); walk up to the counter for the quiz. Ask them your sick-green computer card (happily the lady looks up and gives you her condolences). Your seat is in the coach over the wing (already you’re being shifted).

On the plane everybody knows where you’re going and they treat you like a disease. Finally your joy ride ends and you walk timidly off the plane. Now you find that everyone is trying to get the two dollars you have left. If you’re smart you begin to look for other men going around like you—band together and find a cab.

As everyone knows when you reach the base a sweet, loveable, sergeant comes out to welcome you; "Get the hell out of my cab, you’re moving too slow; hey "TRAINEE," What a word trainee, you get to hate that word after the first day. Everywhere you go it’s "hey trainee."

To get you acclimated to Army life you spend about two weeks in an area designated as pre-basic. It is here that you have your haircut, examination (Idiot Quiz—if you have 3 oranges, 2 pears and a banana, what do you have? Ans: Fruit Salad.) and all your gear.

After this interlude comes the day the buses arrive to take you to the training area. Here is where they separate the people according to the quiz. First, those who show outstanding capacity to be a career man (lifer) go to the easiest training outfit; second, those who show indifference go to the infantry training; and
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finally, those of us that are conscientious objects get placed in a "special training" outfit--here is where I shall spend some time describing this outfit.

Upon arriving here they are greeted very nicely, shown where their sleeping quarters are, and then they change into new fatigue and training begins. You are assigned to platoons and after being greeted by the commanding officer you march with your platoon leader to a place for training. Now the brain washing begins.

Your platoon leader has a cage of chipmunks at his feet. He then has one of the members of the platoon pick up one of the chipmunks and pass him around--everyone gets a friendly feeling towards this warm and timid creature. The platoon sergeant asks you to hand the chipmunk to him after which he proceeds to wring the animal's neck. Almost everyone gets sick--now you march back to the company and have lunch. Afterwards you talk about what you've seen with the sergeant. If no one wishes to talk about it then you are marched back and the same ritual takes place. This continues for one week. Every day your platoon goes out and watches this killing and then eats and, then talks about it. Now they start on bigger animals until you're watching dogs and cats being killed. Now the real nightmare starts.

They have the member of the platoon kill the chipmunks. Everyone in the platoon must kill one and then talk about how it feels to have the life squeezed out by your own hands, to look at the blood on you, and to feel him squirm as he dies. Then everyone must kill bigger and better things.

Oh, yes, I forgot to tell you what happens if you don't kill. The sergeant will "talk" to you in his office--some of the guys say it is a fate worse than death. I don't know.

Now if you're smart you would not enter the Army admitting that you are a C.O. It is far better for you to be one of the indifferent and have normal infantry training.

Finally the day comes to graduate. The day everyone gets promoted to E-2. This is the introduction to the Army or as it is said by the older I bers, "The Real Army."

Next issue: Advanced Individual Training

In Defense of Objectivity and the study of the past - by Lindsay Hill

Second in the conviction that the goals of education are the development of one's own role and the creative expression of one's own feelings and experience, rather than the mastering of verbal summaries of the race's past experience.

President Kline (letter to parents, fall 1971)

... the historical sense involves a perception, not only of the pastness of the past, but of its presence;

T. S. Eliot ("Tradition and the Individual Talent")

President Kline's remark is in reference to certain convictions which he feels Hard students hold dear. The statement does not necessarily reflect his views. I am not convinced that all Hard students hold this view, (although I am sure that some do).

With this in mind, I would like to extricate this remark from the Hard context and attempt to examine it as a dangerous point of view to be held by anyone seeking knowledge.

First the quote implies that education is the development of one's own role. This I think is valid. The article does, however, seem to slander the study of history in the same breath. I would ask how one is to
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develop a sense of one's role without a vital sense of "the race's past experience." Nation-wide the Black and Latin American movements have fought hard for the right to study the history of their people, and this study has been vital to their attempts to establish themselves as human and political entities.

The subjective view seems to hold all of us to be separate from history, implying that once there was a thing called the past, and that we arrived without any connection with it. In short the past can be dismissed as a "verbal summary" summary, because it does not figure in our own private universes, and is irrelevant to our daily lives.

With this view I would strongly disagree. As Mr. Eliot points out, this past is not simply past, but present. We are, in fact, the embodiment of the entirety of the past. We do not simply sit on an island of "present" time, surrounded by a dead sea of past and future. I do not believe that anything exists only unto itself. I have been convinced of this by thinkers from Hegel to Marx, to Einstein. I think that before anyone can realize one's role in anything, one must realize oneself as a contextual part of an entity greater than oneself.

I find the same difficulty in accepting a concept of education which puts the primary accent on the development of "the creative expression of one's own feelings and experience." I have this difficulty because I do not feel that to be truly creative is to be subjective, but rather to be objective. Art which is the result of mere self-indulgence never attains an awareness of itself, or of its place in a cultural or historical framework. It is left as an inaccessible entity, relevant only to its own limited properties.

I believe that the same can be said for the results of self indulgent, subjective education. By this method one is taught that self-awareness is a constant inward turned quest, and that to consider oneself as a part of a greater whole is to limit one's individuality. One is left seeking the world within one's own limited internal universe.

This in my mind is not the goal of education, but rather its antithesis.