COUNCIL ACCEPTS H.P.C. PROPOSAL.

LITERATURE CLUB INSISTING WITHDRAWAL FOR LACK OF FUNDS.

Community Moderator Robert Edmonds reported to Council Monday night. He discussed the open meeting of last Thursday evening which was called to debate House Presidents Committee's new resolution concerning senior women's curfew. Mr. Edmonds reported that 120 people showed up Thursday night; an informal poll showed that 60 were in favor of the proposal, nine were opposed and four abstained. Mr. Edmonds said that discussion centered around questioning the timing of H.P.C.'s proposal in view of all the intervisitations violations which have been handed out recently. The proposal was also criticized on the grounds that the community had not been brought into the discussion before proposals were drawn up.

Council then moved to a vote on the H.P.C. resolution itself, which had been postponed from last week. TheDean said that the Board of Trustees had an open mind concerning the extension of the regulations, but would want to know if students were taking the existing regulations seriously. He added that he wished Council would also consider the motion brought up at H.P.C. that would open women's social rooms.

Councilwoman Alison Raphael moved an amendment to the H.P.C. proposal. The amendment called for Council to recommend to the Administration and Board of Trustees the abolition of all curfews for all women students and the acknowledgment of intervisitations as school policy.

Mr. Edmonds asked if the motion had been brought up at H.P.C. Councilwoman Boldt, chairman of H.P.C., said that it had not. Mr. Edmonds then stated that by voting in favor of the amendment Miss Boldt (who had said that she was in favor of Miss Raphael's amendment), would "reduce the chances of the H.P.C. motion to nil." Miss Boldt called for a roll-call vote on Miss Raphael's amendment. The voting went as follows:

**YES**

Boldt  
Edmonds  
Raphael

**ABSTENTION**

Hodgkinson  
McCune  
Ranschhoff  
Tremper  
Randolph

Chairman Krieger voted "No" to create a tie and defeat the motion, 3-3-0.

Miss Boldt called for a roll-call vote on the H.P.C. proposal;
The motion passed 7-0-1.

The Literature Club had to withdraw its planned magazine due to lack of funds in Convocation. The Club had planned to publish a magazine of literary criticism twice a semester, which would be written by students either specifically for the magazine or from care production; in this way the proposed publication would not compete with the Bard Review or any of the other literary works on campus. The faculty advisor, Mr. Robert Coover, said that the magazine would need about $5000 to publish six-page magazines about the size of the New York Review of Books. It was hoped eventually to reply for funds from some foundation to help defray expenses. The Club was requesting $4000 from Council to be matched by the Administration. When it became evident that Council could not come up with the money, Mr. Coover said that they would withdraw their request and come back in the first week of the spring semester.

Council voted 6-0-3 on a motion to reconvene to the administration that the birth control pamphlets, given as a class gift by last year's senior class, would be placed on tables in the infirmary contrary to the present system which has them available in the infirmary only on request.

Mr. Edmonds reported on the activities of Safety Committee. Mr. Griffiths of E&G had assured the Committee that the entrance to Bard Hall would be repaired as would the theater road. Mr. Edmonds said that he had been informed that opening the Gatehouse to traffic would not be feasible. Mr. Edmonds added that there would be no parking behind the Gym from now on. The Faculty lot, south of the trees and next to Battery Hall, would be open to student parking from 6 P.M. to curfew. New parking lots will also be built at the Minor House and Robbins House. Mr. Edmonds announced that the Bard bus was making runs into Mineville in time to catch the night train on Fridays and was meeting the trains Sunday afternoons. New drivers were hired at $4.75. The motion passed 8-0-0.

Council moved 7-0-1 to consider the purchase of a sound system since some money was returned to Convocation.

Irene Rosen
position to demand. With reasoned arguments based on a clear picture of the present situation, we hope to convince them that this is a useful and necessary change in the social regulations.

5."We also disagree with the attempt to gradually extend curfew by starting with the senior women, why not a meaningful classification rather than an arbitrary one?"

--Again, this is a point clearly explained at several H.P.C. meetings. The Administration feels that, in the interests of security, a small number of girls should first try this new system. Whether the administration will agree to extend these new privileges to seniors is still an open question. It has always been the hope of H.P.C. that curfew would be abolished for the entire upper college.

6."These considerations lead us to suggest that if curfew is to be abolished, it should be abolished in fact, eliminating the need for rules and penalties.

--H.P.C. did not ask for this ideal method at abolishing curfew because we have known from the outset that it would be unacceptable to the administration. The later feel that in their capacity as loco parents they should continue to exercise some control of the students, even if this is just an attempt to state where one can be reached.

H.P.C. recognizes that the proposed regulations are more complicated and stricter than the present system. However, the necessity of enforcing them will be infrequent since very few senior women got enough violations to be put on social probation, for instance. This will definitely be the case if senior women have no curfew, thus eliminating the probability of receiving a curfew violation. And, as Mr. Grady says, "The privilege should be worth the burden of adhering to a system."

Linda Boldt  
Chairman of House Presidents Committee

The Mt. Everest Award goes to Robert Judd and Peter Linchello for climbing over twenty issues of the "Gadfly," because"it was there!"

"Peters," who played Virgil to Marc-Albert Levin of "On the Printempts’ New York" fame (Gadfly, Oct. 20), writes to us; "I have finally decided that it is almost a necessity that we have more than a rudimentary knowledge of a foreign language (English -ed.) before attempting to interview people in that language, as Marc has done, and translating the interview into an essay."

The mighty budget has struck out—again. It certainly looked for a while there that we just might get through the rest of the semester without making a detour into the poorhouse, but that was idle dreaming.

The warning flags went up last week when Mr. McCune announced that Council had something like $100 in the coffers. It became painfully evident this week, when Council had to vote down (or post-pone—same thing), several very pressing proposals, that we are, to put it bluntly, broke.

One of the more unfortunate victims of Council’s queer sort of buy-now-pay-later policy was the Literature Club’s proposed magazine. The new publication was to be set up along the lines of the New York Review of Books. In it were to be all sorts of literary criticism, works done in and out of class. I even heard the interesting possibility of film criticism.

Anyway, this bright-eyed proposal had to be withdrawn when it became clear that it was almost immediately (to Mr. Coover and his associates that Council was in a financial bind. Council ordered to put the $100 request into a fetter which they call "top priority request allocations". The magazine would have had good company; the Observer is already up there for the first $100 which is returned, so is the proposed sound system (also a very reasonable idea). Mr. Coover wisely chose to withdraw the entire proposal and practice what they used to do in Brooklyn, "wait till next year."

Unfortunately, or fortunately as the case may be, Council itself cannot be blamed for this financial drought. Most of the budgets were submitted before-hand and the budget committee did a rotten job that has not come up that any misunderstandings that have arisen about our proposal to abolish curfew for senior women.
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which it is taking at the present. One chilling reminder, we broke even last semester.

Ilono Roson

IN DEFENSE OF THE GADFLY

Needless to say, I am pleased that my favorite weekly campus publication was the subject of a feature article in the other weekly campus publication. I am, however, somewhat saddened by what appears to be an extremely faulty analysis.

I am not entirely sure what, exactly, the criticism of the Gadfly is. Is it that we don't have an identity, or that our identity is unsatisfactory to Mr. Judd and Mr. Minichello? Or is it that we were not having an identity that we said we were going to have, or what?

The only identity the Gadfly has ever claimed for itself is that of a forum of student opinion. Hopefully, that opinion would in fact be diversified. We fall short of the mark in our first semester of publication because of a dearth of outside contributions. Messrs. Judd and Minichello were good enough to quote the demolition of the editors to that effect in our first issue this term. Unfortunately, like most of the quotes in their article, this one was lifted entirely out of context. I did say "we had not intended the Gadfly to become an organ of only one kind of opinion." But I did not go on to say that we intended to remain such a journal. I did say that "we had hoped to have a larger staff, or even capacity to encourage contributions from outside ourselves," and that "...we need a diversity of viewpoint."

Mr. Judd and Mr. Minichello say that the Gadfly has not lived up to its promise to print all except in one instance. I would like to remind them of the various "adventures into the future" of last term, as well as numerous other instances, some admittedly less successful than others.

A sort of statistical analysis is attempted, in order to prove that the Gadfly used few outside contributions ("...only 2h letters up to Vol. II, No li"). I suggest that a more valid kind of analysis would be to determine the average number of outside contributions per issue during last semester, and compare that with the average number for this term. I think such an analysis would show conclusively that the Gadfly is beginning to succeed in its goal of becoming a forum for student opinion. For example, we have printed eighteen outside contributions in six issues, an average of three per issue (and this includes the first issue which was, out of necessity, written almost entirely by the editors). We have, in fact, received so many outside contributions that we have been hard-pressed to print all of them.

Messrs. Judd and Minichello repeatedly refer to the "editorial voice" of the Gadfly, its "editorial statements" and "editorial republics." I think they should be aware of the fact that, except in extremely rare instances such as appeals for funds, no article is ever signed "the editors." Contributions are printed that are signed by one or another of the editors, but these represent their personal opinions, not the opinion of the Gadfly. In decisions to print material, articles by an editor or a member of the staff receive no more and no less consideration than articles and letters from other members of the community.

Among the so-called "random" excerpts listed in the article, are excerpts (born completely out of context) from statements by Mr.aylor, Miss Roson, Mr. Boudor, and myself. None of these represent the opinion of the Gadfly, because such an opinion does not exist.

Finally, we are told that "...the capacity to act constructively has been employed decreasingly since the Gadfly's inception." Perhaps Messrs. Judd and Minichello's definition of "constructive" differs vastly from mine, but considerable evidence could be marshalled that would show the Gadfly to be one of the most constructive publications on campus (this is an opinion shared by the Dean, Mr. Bessler, and various members of the student body). Wide letters in this and recent issues of the Gadfly.

For example, the Gadfly was, for a long time, the only campus publication to print a weekly report of Council meetings. A proposal published in the Gadfly to open the library on Sundays was rejected. A proposal published in the Gadfly to revise registration procedures led to a lessening of problems at that event. A comment on the conditions of student housing led to administration action. A comment on Bard's sabbatical policy led to a clarification by the Dean of that policy. The editors of the Gadfly have been used to articulate student discussion on such issues as the funding of Council, the activities of B.I.A.C., the proposed abolition of senior women's curfew, the potentialities of the community vehicle, and inform the senior class of its responsibilities, rights, etc. In the last issue, there appears a constructive suggestion from Mr. Taylor concerning the bases for discussion of a "pass-fail" grading system at Bard.

In conclusion, gentlemen, the Gadfly is not, and does not intend to be, image-conscious. It hopes, for the uneventful time, to be a forum for con-
community opinion and, by implication, 
"...a critical but ultimately construct- 
ive force in the affairs of the com-
munity." Perhaps it is ironic of me to 
say it, but in terms of the function 
we hope to fulfill, we have very 
little to regret and, perhaps, much of 
which we can be proud.

Joffrey T. Hortimer

-UPON READING-
"BEER AND TOMATO JUICE"

Upon reading "Beer and Tomato Juice" in last week's Godfly, I found myself in a quandary—was this a satire or was this actually a serious commentary? Unfortunately it was written in all earnestness—and my reaction then was—How can you be so blind?

It is wonderful to dream of a Utopia and to dwell within the realms of ab-
stracts. However one can not deny the practical reality of the world in which we live. You speak of "endometers of living in end running through such a society. Come, now, let's be frank-manifesto or in the realm outside of our own narrow bounds to any great degree. You speak of "strict social conventions such as our ever and internatstantial violations," "free determination of individual conduct," and "If you're still hung up about endometers, ask yourself: Would you rather go to a rich college or a good one? Children, may I say that if we don't receive some good endometers at Bard we will not have such of a college, good, bad, rich, poor, or otherwise. The administration position may be shocking and disturbing but the fact is that they are walking a thin line—venturing a liberal attitude at Bard and pleasing responsibilities upon students, and desperately pleading for endometers. The administration is caught between students and those living outside of the Bard community. It can rest in neither camp due to its peculiar position.

This is not the advocacy of the downfall of the Bard system. I advocate the re-examination of the Bard society at all levels. Hopefully, it will lead to more rewarding, calculating, and knowledgeable life at Bard. I do not realize that we do not live within a closed environment consisting of Bard College. We are part of this world, like it or not. Once we realize this, then end only can we implement our ideas, withdrawing from the realities offers no solution for we would then merely exist.

Admit to the totality of life, admit the reality of its truths, and of its, even of them, though many will deflate your balloons of idealism. Come to a realiza-
tion of the entirety of the situation. This does not mean a blind acceptance of all existing doctrines and prac-
tices. It means a knowledge of all the factors contributing to a given situa-
tion and—what are the rules of the game?—the nobles of Crusaders—You parlay out on a football field ready to play a game of baseball, though your game may be admirable and your hearts pure, you will, in a popular term, be "crushed"—you don't stand a chance. Please wake up—realize our potentials, our limits,
To the editors,

There has been a hell of a lot of discussion concerning "The Godfly," People use it as a name-calling word. Someone says "the Bard Run around Crying Committee is a bunch of ninnies," breaks this up with a few vague facts, a liberal dash of sarcasm, and his signature (after all, who's going to know he had the guts to attack this non-establishment establishment without his signature... and the editors found on unsigned letters so much that they won't print them) and drops his little time bomb in Box 81. Promptly next week one or two of the High-Ups in the Bard Run Around Crying committee prefacing their remarks with something like "Mr. Horst's comments barely deserve intellectual consideration because of the infantile manner of his demean stupid insinuation," go on (sometimes for pages) to infintely insinuate the Mr. Horst's a bunch of ninines and so is the Godfly. Of course not all of the name-calling comes from beyond the pale; the editors are pretty good at throwing mudpies too.

People wind up asking themselves "What is the purpose of the Godfly?" Some answers include: A) A couple of nuts trying to make Council look like a lot of monkeys; B) A newspaper designed to make the mighty Observer look like so much dog food; C) Another piece of misinformed junk to litter limbs; or D) Bard's answer to the National Enquirer. Let's look at these assumptions.

First, Council tries awfully hard not to look like monkeys; when they do we just have to remind ourselves that there are a great many simian-like Berdians so what can you expect? As for point B, up until about four weeks ago, nothing could make the Observer look any worse than it was, but -- surprise, surprise -- it's really improved and Bard may find itself stuck with a really worthwhile newspaper yet, and maybe some of the little ditties put into print by the members of the Godfly had something to do with this change. As for the last two items, I'll just say that the Bard Run Around committee has a tendency to turn out hell of a lot of garbage, and I think whoever composed the Godfly to the National Enquirer should be ashamed of himself for reading such things.

So what is the Godfly? Possibly it is a political cartoon without pictures, or perhaps a letter to the editors column of Bellevue, but it does serve a few basic purposes -- it reports on the seditious riles the Council, it gives a few children the opportunity to sound off and throw verbal butterscotch pudding at each other in the "my daddy can lick your daddy" manner, and it gets something said! Some good ideas come out of this little rag. It may wake the sleafstrom of registration a little easier to get through, it may make some of the mightier of Bard's institutions tall the rest of us what they're doing, and it might even make Bard a little better place symbolically. So maybe a little bookbitching works. All I can say is that I think Ilene, Jack, and Jeff are doing this community a service. Good work!

Respectfully,

Gary S. Bratman

To the editors:

A recently published letter in the Godfly on the use of the Bard Community Vehicle was plagued by a number of problems of misinformation.

First, the Community V.W. is the property of the student body, its keys, records of its use, and responsibility for its repair and orderly use all lie with the Keeper of the Keys; the Chairman of the Safety Committee. Further, the Bard Community Vehicle has just concluded a series of tests run to the Rhinecliff station to determine need. The results: Last Sunday evening alone, eighteen students were transported back to their dormitories from the Rhinecliff station; it was favorable. How to and from the Rhinecliff station will leave from Settlers Hall Friday at 6:50 a.m. and Sunday will leave at 6:10 and 8:00 to meet the 6:45 and 8:30 trains from New York. The suggestion to run the V.W. to the Infirmary is, as most students will realize, somewhat impractical. The vehicle already has a heavy schedule, used by the Entertainment Committee, the Dance Club, the Observer, a folk music group, as well as BRAC this week alone. The suggested proposal would necessitate a driver being constantly on call for the several various concerts when students find themselves with hangovers, 18-year-olds, etc. Trips to the Infirmary will most probably in the future, therefore, still rely on friends with cars, as in the past.

Lastly, I have a question of my own. Agreed students often become confused and fail to check out the relevant points of fact in their conclusions, but does not the Godfly have a responsibility to their readers to present these facts and dispel any misunderstandings before it arises?

Sincerely,

Alexander Bocian

Member, Safety Committee