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QUOTE OF THE WEEK

"The right to disagree publicly is one of the privileges of a free society. . . . But when you take to the soapbox of minority opinion, remember that any new idea is easy to talk about but hard to sell. The decibels of your voice and the theatries of your behavior are poor substitutes for the logic of your persuasion and the soundness of your arguments."

THE RIGHT TO DISSENT - Newsweek

6 COUNCILMEN CHOSEN

The results of the election for six Council seats are as follows:

Dan Grady 180
Dick Ransohoff 180
Robert C. Edmonds 178
Linda Boldt 158
Steven Tremper 154
Alison Raphael 134

The three losing candidates are:

Robert Hay 133
Lonnie Yongue 116
Harvey Fleetwood 99

Four of the six winning candidates appeared at Sottery Hall Monday night to present their platforms. The following is a summary of those statements.

Mr. Robert Edmonds said that Council should expand its field of interests. He thought that Council might try to find a solution to the "food problem". One suggestion that he offered was for an improved ventilation system in dining commons.

Mr. Edmonds thought that Council might look into the "telephone" situation as it stands on campus. "At the moment", he said, "there are about 60 people per telephone"; and he thought that this was an unbearable situation.

Mr. Edmonds believed that Council might do something about the poor condition of the roads around campus, and insure that their repair would be more than a superficial job.

He would also like to see a student representative on the Long Range Planning Committee, acting in an advisory capacity.

Mr. Edmonds summed up his position by saying that "Council was not an organ of student concern because it does not yet have the capacity for leadership." He said that "Council could not become functional until it becomes representative of the opinion of the community. Council could increase its responsibility by increasing its capacity to express student opinion."

Miss Linda Boldt said that she supported existing Council programs, and would like to change the 6 Point-Program.

She would like to change the Social Regulations.
She would like to see the implementation of a Due Process Board.

She would like to see a workable management for the Red Balloon, to put it on a profit-making basis for its managers.

Miss Boldt said, that if elected, she would call for a report on the proposal to increase the size of the student body and the proportional numbers of Faculty members.

Mr. Steven Tremper thought that Council should be involved in more areas than the allocation of funds.

He thought that the referendum be used by Council before making major policy decisions.

Mr. Tremper said that the movies on Friday nights were an important function and he made several suggestions for improved viewing. He thought that more current films might be shown. He suggested the purchase of a larger screen to make room for subtitles. He suggested that a second projector be purchased to avoid the long pauses when the projectionist is changing reels; and he suggested the installation of a fan to dissipate the smoke from Sottery Hall.

Mr. Tremper thought that a transportation arrangement similar to the one for Schuyler House, be set up for the residents of Blithewood, Robbins House and Ward Manor.

He suggested an investigation into the possibility of turning the Bard bookstore into a cooperative.

He suggested a commission to investigate the Slater system. Mr. Tremper said that "we should be getting better deals for the money we pay for board."

And, he suggested the formation of a security system to prevent theft from the library.

Miss Alison Raphael said that her platform was similar to that of SDS.
 Raphael (cont.)

She is for the abolition of the women's suffrage.

She is against the payment of the federal minimum wage to all college employees.

She is in favor of the establishment of a Due Process commission.

She would like to see the formation and publication of a community position on Vietnam.

She would like to see the initiation of student planned and taught seminars.

Ilene Rosen

THE SDS MANIFESTO

It may, perhaps, be systematic of a reverse McCarthyism on this campus that I feel obligated to begin this article with a disclaimer, but I want to be clearly understood: I am not now, nor have I ever been, a member of the Republican party. I am not a bircher, a Goldwaterite, a Faylorite, nor do I belong to the Young Americans for Freedom. Most people would consider me an intellectual in the far left wing of the Democratic party, which probably places me somewhere to the right-of-center in the Bard political spectrum. I know, for example, that one of my fellow students referred to my candidacy for Community Council as an example of "right reaction" on campus. So much for the disclaimer.

Now that we know where we stand, I would like to make a few comments on the manifesto issued last week by the Bard chapter of the Students for a Democratic Society. The word "manifesto" may seem rather harsh to some, but it's the only word I can find adequate to describe this document.

I find it rather puzzling that an organization which includes the word "democratic" in its title should have distributed such a statement in the first place. Democracy implies the expression of the will of the majority, but, to my knowledge, the majority of the Bard campus was not consulted about the pronouncements included. Further, no provisions are described for determining what the feelings of the community might be about these proposals. We are simply told that they "ought" to be, "should be", and, in one case, "must" be carried out, the only democracy this resembles is the guided variety, à la Mr. Sukarno.

It also seems evident that SDS has only a hazy notion of democracy itself. Democracy is ordinarily a political phenomenon, an institutionalized means of manipulating the power necessary to preserve society. As a noun of the situations as they exist in our society, it also (lack of acquaintance with the facts)}
SBS manifesto (cont')

Curfew. For all its absurdity, inequity and stupidity, is something I'm afraid we're going to have to live with until we arrive at a radical change in the morals of the American public. In the first place, the Board of Trustees is unlikely to agree to its abolition; in the second place, authors who are worried enough about their darling daughters going off to college are unlikely to send them to a school with no curfew and unlimited intersession, whether or not their imaginations are justified. As for numbers 6 and 7, even if it were possible for the entire community to be informed beforehand of such expenditures (and I understand that it might not be); I am unsure as to what benefit would accrue from our being so informed. Would we all gather on the tennis courts to voice our yea's and nay's? There may be a instance where the administration might just possibly be better able to judge than we are, although this would be no excuse for deliberate accuracy. Numbers 7 and 11 are the vague ones. What exactly is meant by a "specific act"? By what machinery would the results of the referendum bind upon the community? We are also once again confronted with the notion that there is something innately virtuous about the sheer weight of numbers, if 25% of the community (only about 150 individuals) request a referendum on whether or not the rule against going barefoot in dining commons should be enforced, why then shall there be a referendum. On the other hand, a worthwhile but untrivialous proposal might not be exciting enough to sign a petition about, and we would have to go through the dull, old machinery of representative democracy to get action on it.

There has not, to my knowledge (although admitted I am not omniscient), been any great clamor for courses to be offered to the upper College students on a pass-fail basis. It seems that the great goal to be achieved by this is to "give the community an opportunity for experimenting with a new type of grading system." In other words, experimentation, in and of itself and with no particular end in mind, is a wonderful, desirable end. Experimentation is necessary to preserve the vitality of the educational system anywhere, but experimentation for no particular reason is, at best, silly and irrelevant.

What are we left with, then, from this glorious manifesto? "All student markings of non-objective papers and examinations must be abolished" (a point with which no right-thinking Bardian, including myself, would disagree), and "The national minimum wage should be paid to all students and non-students who are employed by Bard College" (the question arises as to how many who are covered by minimum wage law are not being paid the minimum wage—if none there are, action is obviously necessary; but this is in the province of the courts and could hardly be remedied by action on the part of a student or faculty body such as Council or the faculty Senate). It is probably too much to hope that this essay will materially affect the political views of most Bardians, one way or another. It will probably not be as widely read or nodded-in-agreement-over as the SBS statement, and it will be published too late to be used as a coercive force against the candidates for Council. But I hope that the SBS-ers and their followers will somehow come to realize that it is possible for a liberal to question their methods and objectives, that there are those who are neither for them or against them, and that a person who feels he does possess a social conscience can rationally disagree with them without necessarily approving of the Ku Klux Klan or the American Nazi Party.

Jeffrey T. Mottiner

SAND CASTLES AT FLOODWATER

This is the kind of editorial which usually appears before the election, but publishing considerations what they are, and after re-reading the statements of six of the possible nine candidates, I decided that it really didn't matter after all. I sat through about two hours of speeches in Settory Monday night and came away with the profound impression that events which took place this semester just hadn't sunk in to the candidates. They all had this grandiose vision of Council bravely coming to the fore and taking a hand in the planning of the future of Bard, both academic and otherwise.

They, of course, were trying to convince us that they were the people we wanted to help shape our brave new world.

I wonder where these hopefuls were over the long weeks between the beginning of the semester and last Monday night? They had not obviously sat in on many Council meetings, because if they had they would have seen an organ incapable of assuming the tasks proposed. I had written several weeks ago that Council could not being to involve itself in administrative activities until it
had cleaned its own house; by this
I meant a searching examination in-
the idea that one should discover what
it is and what it is not legally
capable of containing. I remember
predicting, oh idealist that I was,
that v. might even see constitutional-
reform before the semester was done.
This, of course, proved to be a mirage.

Now we have nine possible candi-
dates, six of whom felt it important
to appear before what members of the community chose to
show up, and explain their positions
in this waltz of proposals, never
once was there a hint of the possi-
bility that these proposals might
by either illegal or impossible to
enact given the existing structures.
Not one of the candidates suggested
that we examine Council precedent.
Instead they chose to pile upon an,
at best, uncertain foundation, a
broad and broader range of Council
activity, until it resembles a piece
of self-destructive sculpture that
will someday topple over, top-heavy
from its own expansions; leaving
only the ruins and a rotten foun-
dation.

Irene Rosen

ed. note: This was written Monday
night which will explain the refer-
ce to "candidates" rather than to Council members. I feel, how-
ever, that the ideas expressed are still valid given the new circum-
cstances.

The Need for a Definition of
A PLACE OF LEARNING

Scholars throughout the history of university education have debated
the notion of academic freedom consistently. In the last century
John Henry Newman had a tussle with it, and his ideas had a profound
impact on the founding of this college
in 1860. The Bordins of 1966
who lately saw so concerned with
the passing of the "Old Bard" (see
Obituary, 3/24/66) as well as the
"students of the 60's", to use Dr.
Livingston's term in his support
of Due Process (gadfly, 3/9/66),
might do well to take a look at
Newman.

For Newman, the concept of
academic freedom derived from a defi-
nition of "a place of learning." He defined such a place as "an as-
sembly of learned men, zealous for
their own sciences and rivals of
each other... brought, by familiar
acquaintance, for the sake of
intellectual peace, to adjust to-
gether the claims and relations of
their respective subjects of in-
vestigation." Newman extolled the students' place in this scheme:
"Thus is created a pure and clear
atmosphere of thought which the
student also breathes, though in
his own case he only pursues a few
sciences out of the multitude."

Similarly, somewhere, the "students
of the 60's" have kept all definition
of what, properly speaking, constitutes "a place of learning",
and hence their notion of academic freedom is not worth the paper
on
which it is written. So presump-
tuous how they believe that they
assert "rights and responsibilities"
of their own, and yet at a meeting
of candidates for Community Council
last Monday night the only recog-
nizable proposal was the need for
ventilation of Settory Hall during
Friday night movies. These "students'
"speak of the desire to assist in the
determinations of this institution
yet they unwillingly also ask for such
so repugnant that they condemn a
course "because the lectures are
dull and all the student discovers
is that he dislikes." (KPC Report
on the Six Point Program, 3/16/66)

The Due Process statement on
Academic Freedom ignores every edu-
cational advance since Abolard; it
affirms not the right of students to
unhindered study, but the right of
a student to be a non-student. This
"manifesuto" identifies academic freedom with student prerogative; it
fashions students as "citizens" within
the academy, and citizens as
"students" outside of it. When an
individual violates civil codes off
campus, then "the Administration
should oppose students of their
legal rights and offer other assist-
ance." If, in turn, students violate
academic codes, then they may appeal to their "citizen rights" for
liberty to "expression, peaceful assembly, and the
right of petition." Hence irrespon-
sible behavior under the guise
of academic freedom seeks refuge be-
hind "student rights" when in conflict
with civil law and behind "citizen
rights" when it transgresses academ-
ic order.

Rownan's observations, however, pose
a more significant question for the
"students of the 60's". Can the vi-
tality of this institution persist
when students equate academic freedom
with student prerogative, when in sup-
port of this claim they identify
student rights with academic rights,
and hence when the proper sphere of
academic concern expands so commod-
iously as to obviate any notion of
what is properly called a "place of
learning"? Can this place of learning,
on any for that matter, survive for
only minute when individuals justify
acts of "academic freedom" in terms of "academic freedom" and
and "student rights"? Students are students in the academy; and citizens are very much students who function outside of it. The academy is vital only in so far as its members are willing to "adjust together the claims and relations of their respective subjects of investigation."

And this was at one time the "Old Bard" -- just what Norman said it was: "a pure and clear atmosphere of thought" wherein the student perceived the great outlines of knowledge, the principles on which it rests ... as he cannot otherwise apprehend them." What unparalleled audacity it is to see the "Old Bard" as a pinching game, the "Vory Old Bardins", as an egoistic "party giving out." But such are "the students of the 60's" who feel they deserve to receive a 33,000 education, but in reality are nothing more than 32 students.

John Taylor

Letters to the Editors:

The Grizzly:

Among the provincial issues concerning Bard's return to the rustic life are running the unresolved point of cleanliness within this supposed utopian scheme. This problem is not merely one of administrative inadequacy in the areas of facilities (washing machines and leadership) but of a relationship between personal instinct and the environment itself. There are those who have never taken a bath delight in the consideration of themselves as pioneers of inner freedom in parallel with Thoreau's quest. They revel in the pastoral serenity and comfort, and shortcomings of the Bard's campus air and to catch an unformed forest grow invigorate one's senses and sensibilities. But it is a dangerous detachment from the realities of the 20th century. These matters are further complicated by the fact that Bard is no longer a community, no longer an integrated polis of individuals, that there remains only structures and men whose relationships are in a state of entropy. To a large extent the order of the surroundings have instilled a false sense of well being among the students. It has permitted students to believe in their limited measure of freedom over their own lives and still feel content. One confronts students who proclaim a "new individuality" which is in negation of the Bardian ideal. They disinterestedly create a sense of mind and body. They have lost their freedom by their abstention and indifference to self and will. They dwell in the melancholy and self-pitying bulwark of their own supposed impotence.

They exist as hard in lies and make of their life the banality of self-determination and dignity who see themselves as an art form this present situation is dispairing and untenable.

Steven S. Kushnir

To the Editors:

Whither one accepts, rejects, or ignores the students for a Democratic Society's philosophy, its influence on the college campus is undeniable. The Fort Huron Statement, a sixty-three page "Agenda For a Generation" contains an admirable outlay of aspirations -- a healthy, happy, self-directed, stable, understanding, etc. society. I must add that while I do not find these mentioned conditions unadmirable, the infertility of the rational arguments upon which the whole structure rests makes the entire thing unacceptable... The more critical observer might be tempted to regard the Fort Huron Statement as a joke, intended to provide amusement for its creators as they laugh at the gullible. Thus even resulting a particular SDS position, and lending it dignity, would make one the unwary object of the great joke. This "conspiracy theory" may have its merits, but faced with the imminent hazard of being taken in, I intend to treat SDS seriously. The popularly which the Bard SDS Chapter's statement enjoys perhaps justifies such a consideration.

I am going to treat specifically the recent statement by the Bard SDS Chapter. Again I must add that I do not disagree categorically with the positions in the statement. It is the perfect lack of any clear reasons for these positions which is particularly disturbing.

"We seek the establishment of a democracy of individual participation governed by two central aims: that the individual share in those social decisions determining the quality of his life; that society be organized to encourage independence in men and provide the means for their common participation."

Fort Huron Statement, S.D.S.

"In order to further these democratic ideals the Bard College the Bard Chapter of Students for a Democratic Society presents the following program of social and academic change."

Point follow the eleven points which supposedly would further these democratic ideals. The eleven points
are explicitly maintained to be related to the stated or implied "democratic ideal." They are best viewed as deductions from a general concept of democracy. Their validity in this case would rest on the firmness of the first principles of democracy, as defined by the S.D.S. and the strength of the logic in the deductions. If a position is going to be argued from an ideal, that ideal must be carefully established and clearly defined. The steps in the deduction from the ideal to a specific program suggestion must be made explicitly. It is evident that neither the ideals, nor the logical relationship between the ideals and the program, are regrettably expressed.

Perhaps the authors of the Bard S.D.S. statement were really not concerned so much with ideals and offered the quote as merely "reinforcement" to views held independent of those ideals. The program may have been suggested because the eleven points, regardless of their origin or of their ultimate sanction as implementers of "the ideal," are worthwhile in an operational sense. The final statement might serve as an example to clarify this point.

4. The national minimum wage should be paid to all students and non-students who are employed by Bard College.

Just what is meant by this? Obviously the employees under consideration are protected by the national minimum wage law. They do not receive $1.25 per hour as that wage as defined by the law, it is not binding in their specific circumstance. Employers can comply with the law without paying every employee $1.25 per hour. Thus the problem is concerned not so much with the Federal minimum wage as with the establishment of a Bard College minimum wage.

No reasons are given that would convince the reader that it is at all practical to raise those wages. Perhaps lower jobs would be available at $1.25 per hour as the labor is not worth that much. As no evidence is given in support of the practical possibility of such a pay increase, I can simply outflank S.D.S. by demanding $3.00 per hour. Perhaps if practical reasons were given for the proposal, based on empirical evidence and not just "should," it might receive serious consideration.

Before putting an exciting list of proposals, some careful thought and investigation should take place. There is at least some empirical evidence which can be offered. Certainly a platform with no reasons stated for its validity, and no convincing evidence for its practicability, will receive little attention as far as its implementation is concerned.

Those brimming with suggestions might at least consider existing conditions and thus ideal statements with more relevance. The reasons why a position is taken are just as important, if not more important than the position itself.

John E. MacDonald