Council has entered that shadowy twilight zone known as the "lame duck." Traditionally it is a period when a type of "summer madness" sets in; last year the closing week saw Council giving away $3,000, its entire reserves, to the library. This year was no exception. Council careened through Monday's meeting more like a wounded water-buffalo than a lame duck. (See the minutes posted in Hegeman, ed.)

In one session it voted its acceptance of the Due Process report; voted in favor of sending a letter to the administration condemning the use of student markers; it voted in favor of sending a letter to the administration stating its opinion in favor of paying all students and non-students employed by the college no less than the federal minimum wage; it voted in favor of sending a letter to the administration stating that, in its opinion, the penalties for the use and/or possession of narcotics and hallucinatory drugs are too severe and should be reconsidered; and finally, it voted in favor of sending a letter to the administration stating that it was Council's opinion that women's curfew should be abolished by means of the three-step process.

Due Process occupied a special committee most of this semester. It deserved more than the cursory going over it received Monday night. There was almost no discussion until Mr. Lensing raised several objections to the wording and the spirit of the document. He questioned the vagueness and contradictions of the use of such phrases as "undesirable conduct" (Sect. V,A) and "when misconduct results." (Sect. V,C). Mr. Lensing said that the problem of academic freedom could not be solved by voting for or against it. "You do not," he said, "hand out academic freedom like you would a cigarette."

Due Process has yet to go up before the faculty and the Board of Trustees. It is not likely, in the face of the objections raised by Mr. Lensing ab Council, and the disapproval letters simply to go "on the record" which has already been voiced by other members of the faculty and administration, that either body will pass the Due Process Document.

The desire to see the end to student markers is laudable. However, it is assumed that by stating an unfavorable opinion, Council has an alternative plan in mind. Simply saying, "we are opposed," is no solution. It is also avoids the real issues which are too many students, in classes that are too large to be handled by the present numbers of faculty.

Coming out in favor of the federal minimum wage for all college employees is a noble position. However, no attempt was made to discover if the administration had the funds to cover this proposition. Nor did they have any idea where this money was to come from. Mr. Livingston did make one suggestion, that money given to the college for a particular purpose (i.e., the President's House) might well be re-directed to pay college employees.

Hay I remind our honorable chairman that this is known as misrepresentation and is generally considered dishonest.

Stating that the administration position on the use and/or possession of narcotics and hallucinatory drugs is too severe is a fine gesture. But again, stating an opinion will not change the facts. Possession and the use of drugs of this sort is still illegal in the state of New York and what the Community Council of Bard College decides will not make it otherwise. Besides, Council had a chance to formulate a position weeks ago when the faculty statement on narcotics came up for their approval; they chose then to take no position except that the faculty statement was not acceptable. Opposition to a women's curfew may be a very beneficent gesture, but without the approval of the Board of Trustees it does not have a prayer of ever seeing action.

Making motions and sending letters simply to go "on the record" which has already been voiced by other or against a particular issue is
a uniquely fruitless pursuit. No action can follow from these stand-
takings. No serious effort was made to initiate a pilot study of the
wrongs which need righting. (If, for example, Council had agreed to set
up a committee to study the economic considerations of paying the minimum
wage, I would hail it as a step in the right direction rather than a
suitable joke played at the expense of the Community.)

None of the motions made last Monday night will be binding on the
administration; and it must be obvious to all except those who will
not see, that without the support and active participation of the admin-
istration no action can be taken at all.

Ilene Rosen

LETTERS TO THE EDITORS

To the Gadfly Paper:

An editor of your paper recently
disturbed Council proceedings with
a violent outburst directed against
Craig Livingston, and then she
stormed out of the room. The
precipitating incident was Craig's
proposal to send a letter to the
administration stating Council's
opinion that the regulations con-
cerning marijuana were too strong
(i.e., immediate dismissal). Your
editor declared that Craig was not
representing the student body, but
was presenting the opinion of one
person, Craig Livingston. It is un-
fortunate that your editor is so
blind to the opinions of the stud-
ent body and the philosophy behind
representative elections. Perhaps
some of the editor's friends would
be antagonistic towards such a
"radical" letter by Council, but
your editor has no right to accuse
Mr. Livingston of failing to repre-
sent the student body. Not only
that, but I feel that a great major-
ity of the student body would whol-
ly support such a letter, whether
they be marijuana users or not.
Of course, Ilene Rosen is entitled to
her opinion, but she is not entitled
to attack Craig with false accusa-
tions and insufficient data.

Christopher Eggert

(ed. note. I thank Mr. Eggert for
supplying me with the above infor-
mation. I am glad that he is
sufficiently informed so as to be
able to state the opinion of the
great majority of the student body.
I would, however, like to explain
my actions as stated in the first
part of Mr. Eggert's letter. By
"outburst" and my "storming" out of
the room are not entirely related. It
is true that I said that I thought
that Mr. Livingston was not repre-
senting a sizable proportion of
student opinion. I left the room
because I could not bear to watch
the hypocrisy that was being enacted
before my eyes. Council was dis-
cussing an issue that was of vital
concern to both the student body and
the administration. While Mr.
Livingston was purporting to repre-
sent the student body, the admin-
istration was representing not at all,
the Dean having asked permission to
be excused to meet a prior commit-
ment. Council had ceased to be a
Community government and had degen-
erated into a student meeting. As
I said in the opening article, none
of this would be binding on the
administration, and Mr. Livingston
know it.

Ilene Rosen)
"Creeping Multiversity-ism"

In this, the last issue of the Groaf (for this semester, at least), I would like to mention an issue that I hope (probably in vain) people will give some thought to between now and next September.

The issue is what I call "creeping multiversity-ism." I am not one of those who mourn the passing of the "Old Bard." Although not a "very old Bardian," I think I have been here long enough (three years) to be entitled to mourn if I were so inclined. This does not mean, however, that I don't see some distressing signs on our academic horizon. One of these is "creeping multiversity-ism."

There is a disturbing, but quite evident, trend at Bard towards larger and larger student bodies, fewer and fewer faculty members, and loss and loss contact between the two. For example, the innovation of the six-point program, grand in concept but incredibly sloppy in execution, with its accompanying demon, the lecture. Granted that there are some courses that can be taught in no other way, the introduction of the lecture served as the thin edge of the wedge for the notion that all a teacher had to do was stand in front of a class for an hour or two and tell the students what they ought to know. Eventually, the idea of an interchange between faculty and students, of a situation where each was expected to be a participating and contributing member of a group effort towards learning or knowledge or truth, began to fade.

An increase in the student body, without a commensurate increase in the faculty, has led to an intensification of this process, for purely structural reasons (a seminar, to be effective, should have an absolute maximum of fifteen students).

Now the strain is beginning to be felt in the hallowed proclamations of the Upper College. Dual junior conferences are not unknown, and some junior and senior "seminars" are seminars in name only. A proposal has been made that one department experiment with eliminating the individual conference altogether, and replacing it with seminars of four or five students each. One gets the unsettling feeling that this is merely a test case, and if it works out "successfully" (which means for the convenience of the faculty members involved), it may be tried in other departments. I could go on and on about what is wrong with this idea, but the crux of the matter is this: one works for two years to gain admission to the Upper College. One is supposed to have earned the privilege of experiencing certain educational methods, and one of these is the face-to-face, highly personalized and individually structured conference with one's advisor. It would be impossible to achieve the same results in a seminar, no matter how small. Thus far, "creeping multiversity-ism" has struck only at the periphery of the Bard system; now it is advancing towards one of the vital organs. One sometimes wonders if the extra tuition money we are asked to spend in order to "preserve the high quality of education here at Bard," is not being used to pay people to devise means of destroying what is truly unique and worthwhile about that education.

Jeffrey T. Martiner