Student accused, expelled for attack
by Tom Hickerson

On Monday, May 13, a male student was accused of the attempted rape that took place on December 14 and was expelled from campus, pending a hearing of the Grievance Committee, by Dean of Students, Shelley Morgan. Since then, students who believe the accused student's rights were abused, have organized to support his case at the hearing.

On the morning of May 13, a statement was delivered to Morgan from the female student involved in the attack that Morgan described as a "serious statement and accusation." After a meeting with Morgan, the accused student received a notice that he was to be expelled around noon. He was given two hours to leave campus.

Since the Student Judiciary Board was suspended pending revisions, the decision to expel the accused student has rested with Morgan. The student handbook gives the right to expel any student "where she deems it necessary due to the threat of significant physical damage to person or property which brings into reasonable question the prudence of permitting a student to continue as a member of the College."

"Due to the serious and grave nature of the offense and the potentially imminent danger to other people in the community, I took action," Morgan said.

After the accused student was escorted off campus, a group of students who were friends of both the accused and the female student went to Ludlow and demanded to know what was going on. They issued a statement signed by 18 students that says that they felt the accused student's rights were abused and that "we will protect his rights like they were our own."

A student, spearheading the movement to organize the accused's defense for the hearing, who asked not to be named, claimed that in the meeting Morgan said that "she had talked to Bard's lawyer and that it was in the school's best interest and their legal standing to get him off campus." The student organizer said, "they should expect to get a lot of heat for this," and the students have contacted several lawyers since the accused has left campus.

"They are distanc[ing] him from...the best resources for his defense by expelling him," the student said. He also said the accused took a lie detector test which he passed while the local authorities were conducting an investigation of the attempted rape. The investigation was closed and cannot be reopened, according to the organizing student. "We all have the facts...the Grievance Committee victory will speak for itself," he said.

The students who were at the meeting with Morgan have already created a statement they plan to use: "Are you afraid for your personal safety and your rights? You should be. The scapegoat is gone, but the rapist is still on campus." The organizing student is afraid that the real criminal will act again. "I want to alert people," the student said, "that negative vibes are stalking the campus."

Another student was asked to leave this week for a "medical leave of absence." He had several reports filed against him for his disorderly conduct while drunk.

Ludlow takeover ends and negotiations begin... Pages 2, 3, 4, 10, and 11
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Who will guard the guardians?

Forum passes constitution
by Tom Hickerson

After almost two and a half hours of debate and discussion, the second to the last Forum meeting of the year, held on May 14th, finally closed in the field in front of the Old Gym, with a completed Constitution of the Student Association, a bill that changes the name of "freshmen" to "first-year students," and a resolution urging the administration to renovate the Old Gym all voted into effect.

The revised constitution was the final item on the agenda and passed with few amendments. These original revisions included the declaration that representatives of the Student Association shall only be picked by the Student Association and not by the administration, the grouping of committees into permanent, standing and ad-hoc committees, providing a clear method of revising the Constitution, and clearing up several vague statements and phrases.

The Constitution, which was revised by David Rolf and Olivier Boekhorst, underwent several amendments from Jeff Bolden and David Steinburg, primarily. Minor changes included the request for a friendly amendment be made and that no friendly amendments can be made to the Student Convocation's Budget. After the Forum meeting had to be adjourned outside due to scheduling conflicts, the Constitution passed with a vote of 17 for, none against.
Larry Kramer Speaks at Bard

by Greg Giacopio

Upon seeing him, you would never guess that this mild-mannered man in the grey ACT-UP sweatshirt with his dog lounging about his feet was Larry Kramer, the AIDS activist famous for founding the loud and often controversial protest group whose logo he wears on his chest. One might think that this was a proud grandfather spewing out anecdotes of his mischievous grandchildren. Only these “kids,” as Kramer affectionately called them, are usually pulling their pranks on the state and federal government or any other organization that they think can help them fight AIDS.

“We just scored a first,” Kramer beamed proudly as his legs dangled off the stage of Olm Auditorium last Tuesday, “George Bush actually criticized us by name.”

Despite this mention by the president, ACT-UP’s morale is low right now and has been for a year according to Kramer. He said that while ACT-UP is famous, or perhaps infamous with some people, for its attention-grabbing protests “we have accomplished a great many wonderful things” that go unnoticed. For instance, ACT-UP distributes clean needles and condoms for free.

People don’t know this side of ACT-UP,” said Kramer.

Kramer mentioned the St. Patrick’s Day incident in which members of ACT-UP disrupted mass inside St. Patrick’s cathedral and why it was necessary to do things like this. The St. Patrick’s incident did receive a lot of bad press.

“Every major paper crucified us,” Kramer said and then chuckled, “Bad metaphor.”

The meetings which took place after the incident were heated and confused.

“Quite frankly, we were scared shitless,” Kramer said. However, the incident wasn’t all bad. ACT-UP had gained something from all the bad press.

“We had power; it was the most wonderful gift,” Kramer said. “You negotiate from a position of power.”

After this incident people were scared and started to respect ACT-UP out of fear. Perhaps no one was more surprised at this reaction than Kramer himself who mentioned several times that he was no man of violence.

This recognition has helped ACT-UP in many ways. They are represented on every major committee in the National Institute of Health that deals with AIDS.

However, now that they have fought so hard for this representation in the government, the future looks bleak.

“I don’t see very much to be excited about,” Kramer sighed, “knowing how the system works makes it even more depressing.”

Kramer related the tales of bureaucracy inside the FDA that are frightening. The typical time it takes for a drug to be released is twelve years. Not all of this time is spent testing the drug. Most of it is spent processing the pounds of paperwork. The FDA is understaffed, has no central computer system and even has some of its reports done out in longhand according to Kramer. To give an example of the kind of bureaucracy their fight against Kramer cited the fact that every drug application is about 100,000 pages of data of which the company must submit ten copies. This data must then be processed in thirty days according to the law.

“There are so many fucking laws you just can’t move,” Kramer said. The drug testing policy of the government is so slow that an underground democracy their up against Kramer

“Quite contrary to what people think of this kind of bureaucratic wheel turning.”
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Ludlow Vacated

by Kristan Hutchison

At 1:47 a.m. on Saturday morning 34 students filed out the front door of Ludlow onto a quiet campus. The decision to leave without a signed agreement with the administration and without amnesty came after several lengthy discussions, but the students acted quickly once it was made.

In leaving the building the students said they were not giving up the cause for which they had taken it, fair and enforced administration policies on sexual harassment, assault, and rape.

Student dissension

The students hoped that the attention of the campus and the media would center back on that issue, once Ludlow was moved out of the limelight. A mass meeting of over 200 students earlier Friday evening had become distracted when the students as an excuse not to negotiate or grant their demands.

Proposals to vacate

The students and Botstein exchanged proposals for their vacating the building, but could not agree on the wording. The basic proposal the students sent Botstein granted complete amnesty to those in Ludlow and their supporters. Botstein’s counter-proposal included the clause: “This amnesty is contingent on an inspection of the building and its contents to assure that there has been no damage to the building or the building or its contents to its contents.

This amnesty does not indicate any sanction on the part of the college of the action taken.”

The student proposal also set a deadline of 5 p.m. May 17, 1991 by which the negotiations were to be completed. They said they put in the deadline to prevent the administration from dragging the negotiations into the summer, at which point students would go home and the issue would be lost. Botstein’s version lacked a date and instead stated “The negotiations will proceed in a timely fashion.”

The two proposals differed in...
Peace talks and internal debate lead to a continued stalemate.

---

**Timeline of events**

**Friday, May 10**

**10 a.m.** President Botstein walks to security and meets Andy Molloy. After chatting, they walk together to Ludlow to try to speak with the students there. A drunk student outside the building raises a fuss and Botstein leaves. Andy Molloy offers to work as a go-between the two parties.

**3 p.m.** Three students, Erin Law, Renée Plummer, and David Miller, leave Ludlow to speak with Botstein at his house. They went with approval of those students in Ludlow, but not as their representatives.

**Morning**

Botstein is at Lake George on other business for the day. The students are still in Ludlow. Many were up all night discussing the issues. Some simply refused to sleep because of discomfort or excitement.

**7:20 a.m.** Dean Elaine Sproat arrives to offer assistance to those inside Ludlow.

**8 a.m.** Students who were able to sleep begin to wake up.

**8:15 a.m.** Josh Kaufman accepts a packet of information about sexual harassment on college campuses compiled by Great Lakes College Association.

**8:45 a.m.** Dan Bohn retrieves checkbook and a personal letter for two members of the administration. Receives box of doughnuts in exchange.

**9:15 a.m.** Students dropped John Nieman's briefcase to him. However, after an internal debate, they refused to get his datebook.

**9:45 a.m.** Students in Ludlow receive a copy of the Poughkeepsie Journal. Reported that the story was "pretty good."

**10:40 a.m.** Students had removed the barricade from the back door so that people could come and go from the building without using the window. They keep the door locked and monitor who is coming and going, but their security is more relaxed than on Thursday.

**12 a.m.** The meeting between Ludlow student representatives and the trustees was supposed to begin. Was delayed because trustees had not arrived.

**12:25 p.m.** After growing concern about registration, grades, and graduation is expressed, the students in Ludlow agree to allow Annys Wilson to enter Ludlow and work in her office. She is limited to working only on student transcripts and grades and is allowed no phone contact with members of the administration.

**1:45 a.m.** Trustees arrive and meet in the President's room in Kline with Dan Bohn, Sara Davis, Josh Kaufman, and Erin Law.

**1:55 p.m.** Meeting breaks up for the afternoon. The students confer on the lawns outside Kline. After the trustees go to Botstein's house, the students report that the trustees offered to facilitate negotiations with the administration only after students vacated Ludlow, but that they were unwilling to make any promises in writing.

**2:45 p.m.** Students in Ludlow pass down time sheets for work study students and a datebook for John Nieman in a bucket.

**4:10 p.m.** The trustees leave Bard, saying that they are willing to talk again when the students leave Ludlow.

**5:15 p.m.** Students gather for meeting outside Ludlow to express dissatisfaction with those inside. Students on the roof encourage those on the ground to start a petition and to come back at 6:00 p.m. with even more people for a vote on whether they should vacate the building.

**6:00 p.m.** Botstein returns to Bard. Over 200 students gathered outside Ludlow for a meeting which quickly disintegrated into an argument over tactics. The students within Ludlow, are ready to leave by 11:59 p.m. If Botstein will sign an agreement to guarantee amnesty and to negotiate with a deadline of May 17.

**6:35 p.m.** Some students outside felt that Ludlow should be turned back to the administration and that those within should not ask for amnesty because civil disobedience requires accepting the consequences. David Steinberg had a petition with 40 signatures asking the students to vacate Ludlow.

Further disagreement arose as the crowd claimed that the students in Ludlow do not represent them and that they would like to attend the negotiations themselves. The students inside claimed that would be impossible because the negotiations had already begun.

**6:50 p.m.** The meeting disintegrated into argument and personal conflict. A group of students leave to speak directly with Botstein. He invites them to organize and choose an equal number of representatives to join the meeting at 12:00 p.m. on Saturday.

**7:00 p.m.** Forum had been re-scheduled to this time outside Ludlow, but is canceled to prevent forum issues from being lost beneath sexual harassment issues.

**8:00 p.m.** Josh Kaufman, David Miller, and Zeke Cullen go to Botstein's house to get his response to their proposal. Botstein offers a counter-proposal which has no deadline set for the end of the negotiations, allows other groups of students into negotiations, and provides an alternative definition of amnesty.

Meanwhile, back in the building, Chevy Chase called the students. They fax him documents and coverage of the incident and then await his reply.

**9:50 p.m.** Chevy Chase Chose is reported to have called Botstein in the last 45 minutes.

**10:00 p.m.** Students inside Ludlow order $108.50 of Chinese food, before taxes.

**10:35 p.m.** Chevy Chase calls Ludlow again. He advises that they have made their point in taking the building and have gotten the attention of the media. However, Chase warns that the media has a short attention span and that Botstein is prepared to negotiate now, but may not be so eager later. He suggests that they take advantage of the situation now and tell them to call if the administration tries to suspend them.

**10:45 p.m.** A meeting of the entire Ludlow group is called in the lobby. Discussion becomes unproductive as the same issues are covered again and again.

**11:30 p.m.** A smaller group of six key students, who had left the big meeting, begin brainstorming on the third floor about the possibility of leaving Ludlow without a signed agreement.

**11:40 p.m.** The group of six students from upstairs propose that they all leave without amnesty or promises from the administration. The students in Ludlow hope this will put the administration back on the issues of sexual harassment, assault, and rape.

**11:55 p.m.** Andy Molloy arrives with a new proposal from Botstein. He promises that if they will just leave the building they can set any deadline they want for ending negotiations.

**Saturday, May 11**

**12:00 a.m.** The students in Ludlow vote nearly unanimously to clean the building, calling Dick Griffith to inspect for damage, and then to leave quietly, without waking the campus. They plan to meet with Botstein at 10:30 a.m. to begin talks. A student opens her fortune cookie and reads it to the others: "Confidence will lead you on!"

**12:30 a.m.** Cleaning begins. There is a festive atmosphere as students pack up.

**1:30 a.m.** Third Floor Ludlow is declared spotless.

**2:41 a.m.** Cleaning is complete. All student belongings are in the basement. The front door is unwired and unlocked for the first time in 41 hours. Josh Kaufman and Mar??it go to notify Botstein. Dan Bohn goes to wake up Dick Griffith.

**2:50 a.m.** Botstein is waiting in his kitchen for Dick Griffith, along with Morgan, Kaufman, Mar?it, and a photographer from the Poughkeepsie Journal.

**3:00 a.m.** Botstein, Morgan, and Griffiths enter Ludlow by the front door. Botstein and Morgan stand in the lobby among the silent students, while Griffith carefully inspects each room in the building for physical damage.

**4:00 a.m.** Griffiths signs the inspections sheet and lets Botstein into his office.

**4:17 a.m.** Amidst applause and cheers, 34 students, plus the press, leave Ludlow. They pick up their bedding and go home to shower and to sleep for the first time in two days.

**10:00 a.m.** The students from inside Ludlow convense outside Ludlow.

**10:30 a.m.** Twenty-five students from inside Ludlow meet with Botstein, Morgan, Marisa Davis, and Mary Backlund at Botstein's house.

**11:34 a.m.** The 25 students walk out of the meeting with Botstein. They decide to let the second meeting of the day continue without them.

**12:30 p.m.** Representatives from among the students outside Ludlow meet with Botstein, Morgan, Davis, and Backlund in the Olin Poetry Room. The students include Jen Blank, Kiera Van Gelder, Rebecca Burt, Kamran Anwar, Jeremy Berkovits.

**2:00 p.m.** The meeting in Olin ends and both sides seem pleased. Botstein, Morgan, Davis, and Backlund go home for the day.

**2:20 p.m.** Representatives of the two student groups meet in the Coffeeshop. The representatives are Mary Bellow, Jenni Bosang, Sara Davis, Jen Blank, Kiera Van Gelder, and Rebecca Burt.

**4:00 p.m.** The student meeting in the Coffeeshop breaks for the day, but they agree to continue at 10:30 the next morning. They have reconciled many differences and have agreed to work together. From here on it is a process of settling details of policy and demands.

**Sunday, May 12**

Student group representatives continue to meet throughout the day.

**Monday, May 13**

The students arrange to meet with Botstein on Wednesday at 12:30. He has promised to meet with them as many as seven times before the end of the semester.
Negotiators change, but talks continue

by Kristan Hutchison

Students have vacated Ludlow, but it will be a while before they leave the meeting room. At 12:30 p.m. on Wednesday representatives of the new United Coalition of students met with President Leon Botstein and other members of the college administration and staff in the Presidents Room in Kline.

Negotiations have been on-going since Thursday May 9, but those on the opposite side of the table from the students in Ludlow have rotated several times.

Trustees

The first meetings were between representatives of the college; David Schwab, Chairman of the Board of Trustees, John Honey, Trustee, and Jean de Castella de Delley, overseer of the Blum Institute; and the students then inside Ludlow. Those talks reached a stalemate on Friday afternoon because the college representatives were unwilling to talk about the demands of the students until the students left Ludlow. The students felt that Ludlow was their only leverage in negotiations and did not want to give it up until they had some written guarantee that negotiations would occur, according to Dan Bohn, one of the student negotiators.

Practically, the Trustees did not have the authority to negotiate the demands with the students. Their role at the college is to hire and fire the President, but not to dictate policy to him. Therefore they were only able to offer to facilitate negotiations between the administration, whom the students in Ludlow were refusing to speak to, and the students. Eventually the Trustees went home because the talks had halted and neither side seemed willing to compromise further. When they left, Schwab said “When the students are ready to leave the building we’ll be ready to talk again.”

Administration

After leaving Ludlow, 22 of the students went to a meeting Saturday at 10:30 a.m. which had been scheduled on Wednesday before the takeover. They met with Leon Botstein, Shelley Morgan, as well as Marsha Davis and Mary Backlund who were called in by Botstein to join the talks. After about an hour the students walked out because they felt Botstein was lecturing to them and that the meeting was un-productive. They decided not to attend a meeting with the other students and the administration.

The second meeting at 12:30 p.m. had been set up the day before by a group of students dissatisfied with the actions of the Ludlow group. Jen Blank, Kiera Van Gelder, Rebecca Burt, Kamran Anwar, and Jeremy Berkovits met in Olin with some members of the administration that the Ludlow group had met with earlier. After an hour and a half of discussion they left Olin in good spirits. “I hope that something constructive will be reached. We looked at the agenda and what would be feasible,” said Anwar, “we looked for constructive solutions.”

After that meeting all the administrators went home for the weekend, with the understanding that they were on call for further meetings. On Monday the students scheduled eight more hours of meetings to take place before Tuesday May 21. The first meeting was held around noon on Wednesday.

Students

Over the week end representatives from the Ludlow students sat down with representatives from the students who disagreed with them, particularly those involved in Students Against Sexual Harassment, in the CoffeeShop. “We ironed out our differences and decided to move forward,” said David Miller. The students found that they actually agreed on many of the basic issues. Ludlow students realized that the CARES program, a first response to rape counseling program, is going very well already. It will be installed during Language and Thinking Workshops by about 10 students who are staying on campus this summer for that purpose.

“Our belief is not that S.A.S.H. has not been working hard on these issues, they’ve been working hard on these issues, but the administration has not been working hard or sincerely,” said Josh Kaufman.

After the reconciliations, Kiera Van Gelder, head of S.A.S.H. decided to pull out of the discussions. In a letter to “the Ludlow Coalition” she wrote “I hereby transfer all rights and responsibility for C.A.R.E.S. and similar programs to your unified coalition, to be handled and administered as you see fit.” The other students also decided to pull out of the talks because “they said that the time demand is too great,” said Josh Kaufman, “They’ll be here over the summer but they can’t do it now.”

Four or five students were going to meet with the administration on Wednesday, plus two observers. They decided to include two observers to record the proceedings so that anything agreed upon during the meeting could not later be denied. They also chose first-year students as the observers so that Botstein would realize that the issue would be remembered for several generations of students.

The administration and students already agreed on most of the issues. The point of most discussion is the changes to the appeals process.

“We need to get rid of a lot of the informalities that exist in the process because that allows for a lot of abuses of power,” said David Miller. The students want to replace the president’s power of appeal with a board. Miller said that according to Allan Sussman, their lawyer, “The President has no legal justification for claiming that he has final appeal and I think that we are going to call him on that today.” Supposedly the president’s absolute power of appeal is just an agreement between the president and the Board of Trustees.

The meeting will also cover the other demands which remain similar to those published in the Observer Special Issue. In the past few days the students have done more background research on the demands, calling other colleges and checking with experts. Now they have a more detailed idea of what they want. “We just want to find where he [Botstein] stands on that issue and what to do from there,” Miller. They have not ruled out the possibility of further action if the talks go badly.

Students Leaving Ludlow

continued from page 2

their descriptions of the negotiations which were to begin the next day. The students in Ludlow had understood that they would meet with Botstein and Shelley Morgan and that they would consider a preliminary meeting to the real negotiations, which would begin at 12:00 p.m. and include representatives from the students outside Ludlow as well.

During a meeting of the entire Ludlow group in the lobby, which went on for several hours, someone proposed that they leave the building immediately, without asking for amnesty or any signed agreement with the administration. By leaving in such a manner, they thought their statement would have more strength and negotiating power. They also hoped that once they were out of the building they could be reconciled with the student body and use their support to further the negotiations. Finally, they did not rule out the possibility of further direct action if negotiations went badly, but they considered that the administration had now seen that they weren’t afraid to act.

A nearly unanimous hand-vote settled the matter shortly after mid-night. Immediately the mood lightened as students began to pack up their belongings and clean the building.

Though the students were pleased to leave, some were nervous as well. “Personally, I am afraid. I’m just afraid that they’re going to single out those students who spoke to the press to suspend.” However, David Miller, who spoke with Trustee Chey Chase on the phone, said that Chase had promised to help the students if the college attempted to suspend or expel them.

Dick Griffiths was called in to inspect the building, while Botstein, Morgan, and the students waited in the lobby below in silence. Though one drapery was in disarray and a window screen was removed, Griffiths found no damage which could be traced to the students.

Return to Ludlow

On returning to their offices, some of the usual Ludlow occupants found things slightly disrupted. In the registrars office, the window screens were pushed up and they have not been able to get them back down again, which became a problem when the sunny weather gave way to rain on Tuesday. Gladys Watson, Dean of Housing, has also had some difficulties with her personal computer, which was one of the computers used during the takeover for writing up statements and proposals.

Eighty paper cups were missing from the secretariat to the Dean of the College office. "That really upset me," she said, "I bought those with my own money and I consider it a theft." Some phones and chairs were also moved between offices.

However, the general consensus of the administrators in Ludlow was that the students had tried to be very considerate. "Aside from the psychological disturbance, everything was in order," said Stuart Levine, "The students who used my office as some sort of headquarters, actually took very good care of it." Elaine Sproat claimed that the floor was actually cleaner than before and Ellen Getto, Associate Registrar, said that "All the papers that were on my desk were exactly as I had left them."

The biggest disturbance caused by the occupation was to the work schedules of the administrators. "It is a major setback two days before registration to try to condense that amount of work into such a short period of time," said Getto, who like many other administrators has had to work late nights to make up.

Any use the students made of the phones, faxes, and copier on the third floor will come out on those bills at the end of the month. It is not yet known who will pay for those calls, though the students within Ludlow have made casual offers to do so.

An open meeting on Bard Policy on sexual harrassment, assault, and rape.

Wednesday May 15 7:00 Albic Social
Columbia County Youth Project active at Bard

by Kelly Eldridge

On Tuesday evening, May 21, the Columbia County Youth Project (CCYP) Children’s Theatre Group will perform an open improvisation at Bard.

CCYP’s activities have been somewhat limited this semester due to lack of funding. However, Bard Campus Outreach Group (COC) volunteers have remained active, driving to the Hudson-based program three or four times each week to work with youth ranging in age from six months to sixteen years.

Last Sunday, with the help of nine student volunteers, Joel Thomson Bard’s Director of Recreation and Athletics, and the generous people at Wood Food Services, there was a “food and fun day” for the group, held at Bard behind Kline Commons. Even though it was Mother’s Day, twenty-five energetic members were able to attend.

Thanks to a Decentralization Grant from the N.Y. State Council on the Arts, CCYP now has an acting teacher for its Children’s Theatre Group. Gigi Alvare, who has a B.A. ’77 from Bard in Theater, meets each Monday afternoon in Hudson with current Bard Drama/Dance students Kym Mooney and Terence Brown. All semester they have worked with CCYP kids, and have prepared for the performance at Bard on the 21st. (Time and location to be announced.)

For more information, contact Kelly Eldridge at (914) 758-4430, or Lynn Carr (president of CCYP) at (518) 828-9319.
Enigma riddled *London Fields* spins you around

by Jonathan Miller

Billions and billions of years ago, back when folks were actually concerned about the possibility of nuclear war (way, way, way, before 1983), I used to look at farm-fresh lobotomies advocating nuclear power, nuclear weapons, nuclear everything-to-make-sure-our-planet-as-liveable-as-Tewksbury-for-the-next-five-hundred-million-years, and wondering how the poor sycophant slogans-mongers could fool themselves so utterly, when you consider the implications of what they favored. Of course, they didn't consider the implications - what I realized after the seventeenth discussion on *The Day After* (remember that?) is that if you sit in misery and thought about nuclear war every moment of the day, you'd be too miserable to eat your cornflakes. So we didn't think about it, and pretend it doesn't have any impact on us.

Martin Amis' *London Fields* is a tapestry woven of people who don't spend much time thinking about nuclear war. The novel is not about nuclear war. The novel is not about nuclear destruction itself, more of how it hangs over us in our everyday lives, whether we think about it or not. Amis sets up a clever metaphor for the innocent bystander in the age of butt-kicking brinkmanship in his story of Nicola Six, the faintly psychic ex-assist who frequently can tell us when to think about nuclear war. The novel is, more of how

... and of the dividing line between fiction and journalism, then mercilessly beats them over the head with a monkey wrench until they go staggering confusedly through the subplots of his book.

The big surprise of *London Fields* is that it is funny. Martin Amis is the son of Kingsley Amis, a well-known British humorist who has written innumerable novels with a wry sort of winking humor. Amis the Younger adopts his father's comic style, keeping it in check, and uses it to spice his book, rather than let it be the main course. Like Paul Mazursky's *Moscow on the Hudson*, *London Fields* is a serious work with ruminous moments throughout. Martin surpasses his father in stretching for more than Kingsley's good-chuckle-forgrown-ups work ever did. When Martin started out, the conventional wisdom was that he was a literary Julian Lennon. With *London Fields*, Amis shines on his own. When first published in England, the novel reached #1 on the bestseller charts, proving that a book with lucid, vivid character studies and significant philosophical subtexts could be written on a pleasurable mass market level. As deep as it gets at times, *London Fields* never stops being a witty, enjoyable read.

Amis' new novel is a certifiable piece of literature, bringing him out into his own. Insistently readable, it embraces a whirlwind of subplots, subtexts, and fanciful details of modern living. While it occasionally bogs down in too-scrupulous accounting of events, it stays an enjoyable piece of work, with enough complexity to keep you thinking, but enough simplicity to keep you in step with the story. *London Fields* snaps you awake, spins you around through four different lives, and leaves you quietly thinking about all you've read.

*(London Fields* by Martin Amis, ©1989 published by Harmony Books, a division of Crown Publisher, Inc. for $19.95 is available at the bookstore, but last time I checked, there was only one copy left, so you'd better move.)

Classifieds and Personals

To the Ludlow Pirates: "Give us Amnesty or feed us cake..." (I hope you're hungry!!) signed, -BR-

Yeast: Tell him before it's too late! Signed -Infection-

To Amy Less: Love those legs... OH! OH! OH! Oh, by the way, the moustache is coming in nicely... OH! OH! OH!! signed -D.D.-

Lipsious, Please enjoy your summer and I hope you get your "Little Brown Body" back. Signed -TB-

To My Asiatic Sisters: WERE NOT INTERESTED... Signed -Pointless Posse-

To My Asiatic Brothers: PEACE TO YOU, AND MAY CONDOMS STAY WITH YOU. Signed -National-

Hey Kenny... Um, um, um...I don't know what to say... -fast tense-

Susanah: How 'bout a game of Connect the Dots? I'll bring the numbers, you have the Spots... -Joker-

To Schitzo: Please comeback... I miss you. Signed -Your Hair-

Hinch 206: Tricks are for Kids... -Lucky Charme-
John Ashbery: Bard's "Literalist of the Imagination"

by Jonathan Engel

An alarm has been set off. The foyer in which I stand is pierced by the noise, and people sitting in the small park across the street begin to stare. John Ashbery—Pulitzer Prize-winning poet and a recently appointed Bard Professor—returns, shaking his head in annoyance. He has failed to shut off the home security system in time, and now the police must be called. "I did it again," Ashbery confesses into the phone.

Though clearly not a favorite of the alarm company or the local police, Ashbery is, in fact, a well-liked man whose poetry—once dismissed as obscure—has become a potent force in modern verse. His latest book, "Flow Chart" (N.Y., Knopf, 1991), is due out soon, and promises to be a work worthy of this artist, who includes on his eclectic roster of literary influences: Stevens, Auden, Whitman, Thomas Traherne, a seventeenth century English mystical writer, and Holderin, a German poet. He also appreciates Tennyson, who, he says, "really does things nobody else can, although people think he's kind of lightweight."

Ashbery, looking tense and uncomfortable, sits back on the very domestic sofa of an upstairs room. A large T.V. rests on a table in the corner next to it is a collection of Grade B movies on videocassette—almost all vintage black and white. There is also a curious proliferation of Daffy Duck videos. Ashbery has, it is revealed, a penchant for the antiheroes: "good enough to write and not be a writer."

Ashbery comments, and adds meekly, "I'm not a writer."

"I feel Daffy Duck is my alter ego," he says, "he's such a nasty but ingratiating little loudmouth."

Ashbery proceeds to imitate the malicious mallard, affecting a remarkably successful Daffy stutter, "I may be a coward, but I'm a greaseily little coward."

He laughs at himself, and adds, "It struck me like being very much like me."

Ashbery was born in Rochester, N.Y., in 1927, but spent most of his childhood in his father's sapphire orchard on the shore of Lake Ontario. Farm life didn't appeal to the young Ashbery, who, according to his own account, "just wanted to be left alone with my books, but my father had different ideas." When he reached high school age, he was sent to Deerfield Academy—a small preparatory school in Massachusetts—an education ostensibly made possible by a scholarship. The scholarship, however, proved to be a fiction. And, as Ashbery found out later, it was really one of his parents' wealthy friends who had provided the requisite money. The woman had "taken a liking" to Ashbery, and was worried that the local public schools weren't "good enough" for him. Deerfield, however, failed to provide an ideal setting for the bookish adolescent. "I didn't like Deerfield," he says. "It was kind of antediluvian for its time: old money and jock-oriented. It was exactly the kind of place I didn't belong in."

After Deerfield, it was on to Harvard from which he graduated in 1949. Harvard, though "not a particularly receptive place for poets," was ironically populated with many of the poets who would come to dominate the latter half of the twentieth century: Robert Creeley, Adrienne Rich, Kenneth Koch, Robert Bly, Donald Hall, and Frank O'Hara. "If we had known what we were to become, we would have paid some attention to what we were doing," he says, and adds jokingly, "I always thought we were somewhat renegades at Harvard."

Ashbery's desire to experiment. And it was this desire, as well as the imagination of a trend-setting art dealer, that brought about the creation of the famous New York School of poetry. "It's a term that has become applied to a group of friends of which I am one," Ashbery says. "The label was thought up by an art dealer, who published pamphlets of our poetry in connection with his gallery. And at the time the New York School of painting was very much talked about, and so I think he thought if he invented a New York School of poetry that would get talked about too."

He, like most writers, is replete with idiosyncrasies. Ashbery finds it difficult to write after the sun goes down: "even writing a letter" becomes hard later. Commenting on his method, he says, "I get ideas that I write down on little pieces of paper, and then, when I start to write a poem, I try to find them; although I can't always do so, it doesn't really seem to matter all that much." The poet writes most of his poetry in Chelsea, where he lives four days out of the week, and is a self-proclaimed procrastinator, who "until the last possible moment in the day before writing—"

Even though Auden himself selected Ashbery's work Some Trees for publication in the Yale Series of Younger Poets Prize, the poet claims that he wasn't really recognized until later in life. "By the time I did get noticed critically, I was already working without very much input or praise." Ashbery believes that this was a "good thing" because if he had been noticed, "I would have tried to tailor my work to suit an audience."

At the center of his work is "the Almanac," a reflection of what he meant to himself. Ashbery feels especially at home in Hudson, the site of the picturesque Victorian in which he lives. His house, located in "an oasis of gentility," seems far away from the urban decay of the town. "The town," Ashbery comments, "is not unlike the town in It's a Wonderful Life, if Jimmy Stewart had committed suicide."

Ashbery is an enigmatic figure, often tentative in his speech and manner, who worries that what he has said is "not a faithful reflection of what I meant to say," and, not surprisingly, is reticent to label himself. "I don't know what I see myself as," Ashbery says, and continues, "I've often been struck by a line from the Cocteau movie Orpheus. He was being examined by these three sinister judges, and one of them says, 'what do you do?' And Orpheus says, 'I am a poet,' and the judge says, 'what does that mean,' to which Orpheus replies, 'it's to write and not be a writer.'"

—Ashbery on his alter ego

It's to write and not be a writer.
—Ashbery and Cocteau on the poet

__An excerpt from The Instruction Manual__

As I sit looking out of a window of the building
I wish I did not have to write the instruction manual on the uses of a new metal.
I look down into the street and see people, each walking with an inner peace,
And they are so far away from me!
Not one of them had to worry about getting out this manual on schedule.

And, as my way is, I begin to dream, resting my elbows on the desk and leaning out of the window a little.

Of dim Guadalajara! City of rose-colored flowers!
City I wanted most to see, and most did not see, in Mexico!
But I fancy I see, under the press of having to write the instruction manual.
Your public square, city, with its elaborate bandstand,

He is such a nasty and ingratiating little loudmouth.
—Ashbery on his alter ego

Tailoring that could have been done, certainly would not have been motivated by pecuniary reward, since "there was never any money involved." The Pulitzer Prize, when he won it, only brought a thousand dollars.

His "strangeness," however, does not exclude the contemporary and the banal from his work, in fact, these elements are crucial to his poetic vision. "Much of the material in my work," Ashbery says, "comes from popular culture: B movies, television, the National Enquirer, but things I hear people telling each other on the street. I feel very much a part of the popular world."

Ashbery feels especially at home in Hudson, the site of the picturesque Victorian in which he lives. His house, located in "an oasis of gentility," seems far away from the urban decay of the town. "The town," Ashbery comments, "is not unlike the town in It's a Wonderful Life, if Jimmy Stewart had committed suicide."

Ashbery is an enigmatic figure, often tentative in his speech and manner, who worries that what he has said is "not a faithful reflection of what I meant to say." Not surprisingly, he is reticent to label himself. "I don't know what I see myself as," Ashbery says, and continues, "I've often been struck by a line from the Cocteau movie Orpheus. He was being examined by these three sinister judges, and one of them says, 'what do you do?' And Orpheus says, 'I am a poet,' and the judge says, 'what does that mean,' to which Orpheus replies, 'it's to write and not be a writer.'"
Sober softballers say, "No Mas!"

by Matt Apple

The Bard Intramural softball season came to a dramatic close this past week, with two close games and one not-so-close game deciding which teams would continue into the playoffs. The Cunning Linguists ended the season with a perfect 5-0 record by defeating Soixante-Neuf Annee Erotique 7 to 3 to clinch the Hudson League title. Soixante’s loss forced them into a 4-1 tie with Bard Emissions and out of the playoffs, since they lost to Emissions during the season. In a game decided in the last inning by a home run, Gonna Get Our Butts Kicked defeated My Little Pony by a 6 to 5 score. Although GGOBK ended in a tie with the Stoolies for first in the Annandale League, the Stoolies came away with the title, having defeated GGOBK in their game.

Ground Zero finished with a 5-0 record in the River League, eliminating the People’s Film Front Softball Liberation Army from the playoffs with a 28-4 score in their last game. As their record was incorrectly printed last issue as 2 wins, 2 losses (my fault, Rusty meister), the PFSLA was actually 3 and 1, all three wins being top decisions during the season. In a game decided in the last inning by a home run, Gonna Get Our Butts Kicked defeated My Little Pony by a 6 to 5 score. Although GGOBK ended in a tie with the Stoolies for first in the Annandale League, the Stoolies came away with the title, having defeated GGOBK in their game.

The regular season has ended, leaving behind the eight survivors of the grueling campaign to fight it out between the ultimate pin-nacle of Bardian triumph... the crown of the softball kings of Kline Commons Field (Kegger). If you missed any of the action on Monday and Tuesday, tomorrow, it only gets better from here on out... yes, boys and girls, it’s time once again for our spectacular... Game of the Week.

Today’s Game of the Week occurred last Saturday during a rainy-out make-up game in a battle for the cellar of the Hudson League between the Andes and Margaret and the Meatbangers Banging Back. The weather, it was hot, but the players were not. The game dragged on into the fourth inning, the score teeter-tottering between the two teams. Margaret’s Meatbangers finally ended up on top 10 to 5 going into the last inning of play. With one man on base, John Elliot of the Andes hit a long, high, tremendous shot that hit the top of the tree down the leftfield foul line. The Andes proceeded to load the bases, but could not push across any more runs. The game ended 10-7 with the bases loaded on a very close, called third strike, a call which, in my opinion, the umpire should not have made since it was a horrible way to end a ballgame and this game was of extreme importance. I mean, give the batter a chance! This is softball, he’s supposed to hit the ball, and... yeah, the Andes were my team. Nothing like a little objective journalism, ya know? (Give me a break. We enjoyed the game anyways.)

Final League Standings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hudson League</th>
<th>River League</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cunning Linguists†</td>
<td>Ground Zero†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bard Emissions†</td>
<td>Senseless Datum†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soixante-Neuf Annee...</td>
<td>PFSLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret &amp; the Meat...</td>
<td>Take It Out It Hurts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the Andes</td>
<td>(Please God) Don’t Let...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiddle Heads</td>
<td>SPS α &amp; Z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catskill League</td>
<td>Annandale League</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Did With James Brown*</td>
<td>Gonna Get Our Butts...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the Stoolies†</td>
<td>the Stoolies†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the Brute Marsupials</td>
<td>My Little Pony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Funk Enema</td>
<td>Wig Hat On Your Head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masuginik’ae’s</td>
<td>the Screaming Kostabi’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last Temptation of Brutus</td>
<td>Capitalist Pigs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mostly Uncordinated...</td>
<td>Observer Flunkies*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* league winner  † clinched playoff spot  ‡ didn’t participate

Playoff Picture

Monday May 20
5:00—Bard Emissions d. Ground Zero
6:00—the Stoolies d. the Stoolies

Tuesday May 21
5:00—the Cunning Linguists d. Senseless Datum
6:00—I Did It With James Brown d. Gonna Get Our Butts Kicked

Semifinals

Wednesday May 22
5:00—Cunning Linguists vs. I Did It With James Brown
6:00—the Stoolies vs. Bard Emissions

Final

Thursday May 23 at 6:00

Softball Sluggers

Most Homeruns

5 Homeruns
- Tony Almaka—the Pitters
- 4 homeruns
- Bennett Lieberman—I did it with James Brown
- Rory Makem—the Stoolies
- 3 homeruns
- Terry—Ground Zero
- Justin Zaug—I did it with James Brown
- 2 homeruns
- Price Mason—Cunning Linguists
- Charlie—Gonna Get Our Butts Kicked
- Steve—Bard Emissions

Grand Slams

Bennett Lieberman—I did it with James Brown
Rory Makem—the Stoolies
Steve Race—Ground Zero
Ed Slocomb—Grand Funk Enema
Jitesh Ladwa—Mostly Uncoordinated Nerds
Nathan James—the Pitters

Most strikeouts by a pitcher

7—Carrie Eudaly—Cunning Linguists
7—Laurie—Ground Zero

Congratulations to everyone !!!

Softball Results - last week

Cunning Linguists d. Soixante-Neuf Annee Erotique 7-3
Margaret & the Meatbangers Banging Back d. the Andes 10-7
Bard Emissions d. Fiddle Heads forfeit
Ground Zero d. PFSLA 28-4
Take It Out It Hurts d. (Please God) Don’t Let Them... forfeit
Mostly Uncordinated... d. Senseless Datum d. SPS α & Z 16-13
Masekinikae’s... d. Last Temptation of Brutus forfeit
I Did It With James Brown d. Grand Funk Enema 23-1
the Pitters d. Mostly Uncoordinated Nerds 16-5
the Brute Marsupials d. Grand Funk Enema 7-8
Senseless Datum d. Take It Out It Hurts forfeit
I Did It With James Brown d. Mostly Uncordinated... forfeit
Capitalist Pigs d. The Screaming Kostabi’s forfeit
Gonna Get Our Butts Kicked d. My Little Pony 6-5
the Stoolies d. Wig Hat On Your Hat 8-3
Wig Hat On Your Head and Capitalist Pigs both lost - no show
You asked for a computer that's real college material.

We heard you.

The ideal computer for college needs certain things. Like a mouse, to make it easy to use. Preloaded software, that'll let you create impressive papers with graphics and spreadsheets. And great tools, like a notepad, calendar and cardfile. It should also be expandable, so it can grow with your needs.

The IBM Personal System/2® has all this at a special student price and affordable loan payments. And on a different note, you can get a great low price on the Roland® Desktop Music System that transforms your IBM PS/2® with Micro Channel® into an exciting, comprehensive music maker.

The PS/2 is perfect for college because you told us just what you needed. And no one knows what it takes to be real college material better than you.

If you are interested in purchasing an IBM computer, contact Bonnie Gilman at x496.
Outraged at Tactics

To the Bard community,

We are outraged and insulted by the blatant mishandling of a life threatening issue by a small number of individuals who have taken it upon themselves to act as the voice of the Bard community.

The tactics employed to demand changes in the administrative policy regarding the handling of sexual offenses were irresponsible, dangerous, coercive, and misleading. Those who have occupied Ludlow have incited public sentiment without clarifying the organized agenda to the community.

Those who have occupied Ludlow have incited public sentiment without clarifying the organized agenda to the community. Those who were called upon to rally outside of Ludlow were told that all primary channels had been exhausted prior to the takeover of Ludlow. What was NOT mentioned, however, was that a meeting with Leon had already been scheduled for Saturday, May 11. Why wasn't more effort taken to mobilize students before such drastic, unnecessary action was taken? If the individuals who occupied Ludlow had informed the community of their concerns about the issue of sexual harassment, they would have found support from the vast majority of us, and the community could have worked together towards a constructive solution.

By initially focusing on a specific case, the real issue has been clouded and the community has been divided. By galvanizing the situation with the tactics employed in a specific action, a line has been drawn. Is it not possible that some members of this community agree that changes need to be made but are offended by the spectacle staged at Ludlow?

By certain individuals appointing themselves to speak for the community at large without our consent or support, they've silenced the voices of those who could've fought for constructive change.

The best example to illustrate this point is the gathering that took place outside of Ludlow on Friday May 10, when those on the roof addressed those below them about the nature of the protest meeting with the administration on Saturday, May 11. A request for input from the rest of the community was met with the direction to elect additional students from those below. Suggestions for a vote were circumvented by the mad notion that the administration only wanted to negotiate with anyone who stood on top of a building. When the members of the community who refused to be silenced attended the meeting with the administration on Saturday, the original representatives from the Ludlow group did not attend, wanting their own meeting. This refusal to cooperate and compromise with the members of the very community that these individuals' actions should represent makes us wary of the competence they might have had in negotiating with the administration in our name.

Furthermore, we are offended by the unwillingness of these individuals to accept responsibility for their actions. Being account- able for one's actions and their consequences is a pre-requisite for political activity. To point a lofty, self-righteous finger at those who are not willing to take risks by using the tactics employed in the takeover seems hypocritical when those involved requested amnesty.

The "direct action" taken has slandered, used, hurt and exploited certain people in the process. To say that this issue is not about specific case (in retrospect) when every paper that covered this issue printed specifics from one case (which were slanted as well) is not sufficient. Why was the name of the accused given to the press? Why was a member of his family slandered in information on the walls of the coffee shop, and on reserve in the library? If those responsible for this situation had any foresight whatsoever, they might have realized how such irresponsible tactics have reflected on the community at large.

Breaching confidentiality pertaining to the accused and to the victim (which initially occurred without consent) sets an extremely dangerous precedent. Even with the victims consent after the fact, the callous lack of foresight in this issue is a violation both to the individuals directly involved and the community as a whole. If confidentiality is NOT assured in such a case, then who is to say that it would not prevent someone from stepping forward in the future?

The breach of trust spoken of between the student body and the administration is mirrored clearly in the actions of the individuals on top of Ludlow. We doubt that many at Bard "tolerate rape." While this slogan effectively draws the media, it is coercive as well. By attempting to play on people's liberal tendencies, these individuals have used the present trend of P.C. issues to mislead, and violate. By appropriating the voices of the community, they have misrepresented and publicly implicated us.

These tactics are in direct opposition to S.A.S.H.'s attempts to dissolve the fears and guilt surrounding issues of rape and sexual harassment. The concept of open communication and active listening have been undermined by this incident. Aside from the demands of the Ludlow students finally consented to work towards all year, when these students finally consented to work with the members of the S.A.S.H., the members of S.A.S.H. were asked to help with the proposed demands on the terms and time restrictions of the Ludlow students.

It is ironic that a number of us have had to rebel against these tactics in order to take back our voices when we are fighting for the same cause. We feel that this situation has caused more problems than it has solved. But since these individuals' actions speak for the community, they remain accountable to that community. We feel that the "leverag>e" that certain individuals seem to think they've achieved by this incident has been nullified by the resulting split in our community. While they verbally begged for unity, the actions of these individuals have produced the opposite result; by alienating the administration and the students (specifically, but not exclusively), those who have been working all along toward constructive solutions), hatred and division have been perpetuated, not eradicated.

Such violent public spectacles warrant public written apologies. Those who are responsible for hurting others should be accustomed to the fact that ultimately everyone is accountable to themselves. The fact that we have to request such apologies in the first place says something, but demanding them would cease to make them sincere. Those of us who sign this letter do not wish to occupy the rooms of those we look to, rather we hope to clarify certain issues which we feel need to be addressed, and elicit an appropriate response.

We beg insightful reflection into this incident; if these differences can be solved and if compromise within the community can be reached, we fear that a disgraceful display like the one we recently witnessed will occur again and the real issue at hand will never truly be dealt with constructively.

Respectfully,
Pamela Teitelbaum
Kiera Van Gelder
Glynis Cotton
Aretha Sills
Rob Brunner
Max Howver
Seren Morey
Becky Marginelli
B. Stefans
Anvar Khuri
Nirima Bucha
Jeremy Bercovitz

Ludlow Debate

Occupation explained

To the Bard community,

We are concerned about the misinformation being distributed around campus regarding the Ludlow takeover. We realize that this direct action has generated heated debate on our campus, however we feel that the actions were and remains justified.

Direct action causes confrontation which causes people to deal with the political realities that they live in and tolerate. The issue is sexual assault and harassment, and the abuses of the administration.

To dwell on the pettiness of things written on bathroom walls, and obscuring the problem of sexual assault and harassment with divisive complaints regarding tactics and methods is callous, short-sighted and unfortunate. We took full responsibility for our actions and risked suspension, because the system had and continues to fail. We feel that the President did nothing illegal in the last case. As the person most responsible for the financial security of the institution, and unfortunately also potentially the final judge and jury, these roles can conflict. This conflict of interest can result in ethical misconduct.

We demand a radical overhaul of the present appeals process. The final say in cases concerning sexual assault and rape must not be convoluted and clouded by ANY OTHER ISSUE.

To address specific criticisms:

1) The meeting of Saturday, May 11, at 12:30 PM at the President's house, was not attended by any one who was inside Ludlow because members of the many interested parties were not able to meet prior to that time. It is absurd to assert that anything constructive could be accomplished in a meeting with more than one agenda, especially when attempting to negotiate with Leon Bot- stein.

2) The accusation that anyone from inside Ludlow released names or personal information regarding individuals involved in the case is incorrect, if not a malicious lie.

3) We do not invalidate the conclusions made by S.A.S.H. towards greater awareness and education to the Bard community. Regardless, this most efforts to date taken by S.A.S.H. towards eliciting change have been stymied by the administration's lack of immediate active interest, and thus rendered those efforts ineffectual. Another fact miscommunicated was the implication that S.A.S.H. was not represented by individuals inside the building. Five members of the S.A.S.H. core group were inside the building, as well as several others helping with outside efforts.

Our taking of Ludlow has spawned debate that otherwise not be present, and will initiate long term changes in the system. We realize that many persons have been forced to confront their own demons - it is regrettable that some choose to avert their gaze.

Sincerely,
David Miller and Erin J. Law

Carmel Holt
Jennifer Elise Coebel
Peter M. Kelly
Gia Buonaguro
Stephanie Gwinn
Eva Victorof
Christian A. GFOuld
Lorna Kesseler
Karen Feldman
Hannah E. Byrum
Cassandra Target
Elizabeth English
Jeff Mellonbock
Odele Pound

NOTE: This letter was only circulated within the community for a short while. A copy of this letter will be posted in the coffee shop for anyone wishing to add their signature. Hopefully it won't get ripped down before it appears in the Observer.
More students for Sproat

Dear President Leon Botstein,

I am writing to voice my disapproval of the college's decision to terminate the employment of Elaine Sproat. Dean Sproat's work on campus has helped the student body in many ways. For me, having a learning disability, she has provided me academic support in the classroom. In the past, this was not available. Yet there are many learning disabled students at the college who need continued and additional academic support. Dean Sproat was first to set up a meeting regarding the start of academic support services for students with learning disabilities (differences). For students such as myself, this was an extremely important step. As I informed you in my letter of April 16 (I asked that you attend the meeting to discuss this problem), I assume you had a prior engagement. Students with learning differences have been ignored on this campus. Elaine Sproat through her efforts and dedication, has worked to improve the situation.

By not rehiring Dean Sproat, the school is continuing to ignore the issue. I do not believe that a part-time dean can possibly put in the necessary hours that Elaine has in helping students with learning disabilities. It is important to Bard students' academic life that she be returned to her position and continue to work with the college in getting academic support services for students with learning disabilities which are required by Federal Law and which would benefit the entire student population. If she does not get rehired, the students with learning disabilities like myself will be set back tremendously.

While I have only discussed the help Elaine Sproat has given to learning disabled students, you should not assume that has been her only contribution to the campus. Dean Sproat has made her presence at Bard well known. She is a vital asset to the student community. It seems that Bard College can't afford to lose Dean Elaine Sproat.

Sincerely,

Stephen Moyer

---

Dear Dean Levine,

I am dismayed at the dismissal of Elaine Sproat. I have never met a more hardworking and caring administrator. She is a credit to this college, and I am not at all convinced that eliminating her position is the only economizing option available.

Her loss will be a loss to the students of this college; in her work with scholarships, students with learning differences, the writing tutor program, and everyone she works with, she has carved out a niche which will allow fewer students to fall through the cracks. This is not to say that they would fail otherwise, but they need a caring and sympathetic administration which is not insensitive to their special problems. She addresses real gaps in student experience here...

We were led to believe that she would be here for a long term, and dropping her so soon after her arrival, even with the latest budgetary crisis, seems to point to poor planning or dishonest policy. I feel that her salary cannot be such a burden to this college, given that she keeps hours that are above and beyond the call of duty, makes the administration more accessible to students, and occupies a special place in our regard. No part-time dean could do the work she does.

Sincerely,

Michael M. McDonough

---

To the Editor:

This letter is to thank everyone who was part of the Ludlow occupation. You are a group of very brave individuals. I especially admire those people who did not know the particulars of any specific case, but who joined simply out of their desire to change the system.

I would also like to express my gratitude to everyone who has lent support to the changes we are trying to make, even when they disagreed with our tactics.

I would also like to thank the Observer. The Observer staff was hauled in a very professional manner throughout the entire Ludlow event. I spoke to many reporters from many different news agencies and the Observer staff was comparable to them in sophistication and energy.

Lastly, I would like to reiterate that community members interested in preventing sexual assault should put their energy into making the College's policy for dealing with disciplinary problems more equitable. The best way to ensure justice for plaintiffs and defendants is to make sure the judicial processes at Bard are clear, fair and accessible to all students.

Sincerely,

Michael M. McDonough

---

A big thank you

To the Editor:

This letter is to thank those who supported the occupation of Ludlow. Your demonstration of commitment to changing the existing policy generated awareness about rape and sexual assault. This helped transform the demonstration from a protest to a pro-active event.

Although this issue is divisive, your support proves that the community does care and demands a change in the existing judicial policy, which as it stands now is easily influenced by a person's racial, social, or economic background.

The Observer's coverage throughout and since the takeover of Ludlow has been thorough and impartial. This is very important when dealing with an issue which is often disregarded and minimized.

In addition, I am very grateful to those who gave food, blankets, or who helped sustain the picket and vigil.

Signed,

Katherine Moog

---

Wood Food Service Needs your Help

Wood needs students to help in all areas of the kitchen and waiting staffs for commencement.

Contact Ralph Rogers in Kline Commons

---
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$80,000: You didn't have to spend it all in one place by Dan Hillman

Editor's note: This article, originally titled "$80,000: You didn't have to spend it all in one place," first appeared in the now-legendary "Evil Twin" issue of May 20, 1988, back in the days when the Observer was a total joke, and a wildly funny one at that. We have updated the figures to reflect ever-rising costs.

If you're a senior, on Saturday, May 25th, Leon will put a rolled-up paper in your left hand and shake your right. A photographer will record the moment. Then, except for some nostalgic musings, you're out of here. That's it, no more, end of the line, splitville, goodbye, and take off, you losers. It's over and you can never come back again without seeming like a sentimental drip.

Then, one day, perhaps a week later, or maybe never, you'll realize that somebody paid over $80,000 for that rolled-up paper. You'll examine that photograph and truly see it for the first time. You'll see a picture of Leon hiding the smallest of smiles as he hands you the, naively one with the ear-to-ear grin, a piece of paper that cost about ten cents to photocopy.

It is at this moment that your education will be complete. Suddenly you'll stop and realize that

$80,000: equals
- 8,750,000 french fries from McDonald's
- 1,962,396 lubricated condoms at bulk rate. If you started using them on the day you turned 16 and kept going until you died at age 80, you'd have to do it every day to wear them all before you died (a very tired and person with a very big smile).
- 405,846 ping pong balls.
- 280,000 45 RPM records from GAF, Unic. That's enough time to keep you occupied for over three a year without repeating a song.
- 280,000 superballs from the gumball machine in Jamesway. Imagine dropping all of them off the roof of Stone Row and watching them bounce through main campus.
- 200,000 cans of Meister Brau (by the Grand Union 12-pack). If you sealed off the Old Gym and emptied them on the floor you'd have a pool about 37 inches deep with three feet of foam on top. Think about it.
- 127,272 copies of the National Enquirer. Cut out all the pictures of Elvish paste 'em in your trailer.
- 94,594 hamburgers at McDonald's. Yum.
- 71,428 Playboy air fresheners. Perfect for keeping the ol' Camaro smelling prime.
- 80,000 doses of LSD at current campus cost. Scramble your brains without using a wisk!
- 80,000 movie rentals (if you can still find a place that'll rent to Bard students). See every John Hughes film ever made. Twice. Even the nasty ones they hide in the back.
- 6,032 rounds of nineteen-millimeter exploding ammunition and a couple Uzis. Great fun for you and a friend at your local shopping mall.
- 39,106 pairs of fuzzy dice. What good is a smelly Camaro if it doesn't look tuff?
- 38,347 pints of Guinness in a Dublin pub with plane tickets to get there and back.
- 31,111 copies of the new Mag magazine at the newsstand price. A working knowledge of the latest issue makes any Neanderthal or Neanderthallette sound liberated.
- 28,000 yo-yos. The kind you play with, not the kind you'll soon be working for (those are cheaper).
- 17,543 sets of plastic vomit. Next idea, but where would you keep them?
- 10,233 large cheese pizzas from Broadway. That's 4,018 square feet of cheesy goodness, or roughly enough to carpet every room on the first floor of Jewsbury and the foyers in Olin.
- 3,071 deluxe rubber chickens. Just like the ones you've been eating for the last four years.
- 10,000 movies in New York City. Think about 7,500 hours spent waiting in line.
- 6,856 senior project binders at the new and improved price of $5,384. Stacked in their cases, that would make a pile roughly four times the height of Stone Row. Pretty scary, huh?
- 4,666 concert tickets. Invite your friends! What the heck, take half of Red Hook to see your favorite band.
- 4,129 Entry passes for Disneyland. You could go there every day for almost 11 years and four months and stare at all the people waiting in line.
- 1,993 pounds of marijuana at current campus rates. This amount is not based on bulk discount.
- 437.5 pounds of mushrooms at current campus rates. Much cheaper than flying in a plane and you don't even have to eat the food.
- 314 of Leon's bow ties at the going auction price. Perfect for covering up that scar where they tried to cut off your head.
- 291 cases of good scotch. No one actually drinks the stuff, but keep a bottle in your desk at all times for that "private investigator" look.
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