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COUNCIL ALLOTS OVER $16,000 TO
TEN ORGANIZATIONS; ELECTIONS TWO
COMMITTEES.

At Sottery Hall on Monday night, Council elected six people to two committees, passed two procedural
motions, heard an Institutional report, and allotted over $16,000 to 21 organizations.

Council first elected members to the Constitutional Committee. Bill Dump and Matt Perlstein (from the
Community) and Jeff Hochlis (re-elected) and Jeff Levy (both Council members) will comprise the Constitutional
Committee. John Goodman and Steven Perlstein will serve on the Sottery Committee (which is concerned with long-
range planning).

Anita McColloch then read the Institutional Committee report which
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DROPS BUVES OIL THE '53 K
"The food at Dining Commons serves
a good purpose-it takes the students' attention away from the Administration"

--overheard at a dinner at the President's house.

+++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++

dealt principally with the Dining Commons survey administered to students last semester. She criticized the
results as "nebulose," because they were divided into arbitrary and unfair "liked" and "disliked" responses. A
suggestion was made that peanut butter and jelly be provided for those who do not care for either selection of
food. The President reported that the new Dining Commons Building is on the College's top priority expansion
list and would be built within a year and a half.

Councilman Rochlis proposed three new procedural points. The first, that concessions submit a financial
report to Council every four weeks (beginning March 30) was defeated. The second, that a complete Treasurer's
report be submitted to Council was passed, as was the third motion, that each club notify the Treasurer within
one week after the cancellation of a financial commitment (i.e., a speaker or group).

Finally Council reached the main matter of business, the appropriations for twenty-five campus organizations. The total requested budget was $323,000, the Budget Committee
recommended that they receive $14,000, and it was up to Council to make the final decision. Council had some
$20,147 in the Treasury (including over $6,000 from last semester), and $1,754 already committed to organizations for this semester. Council allotted the following sums to 21 organizations: they did not allot the Jewish Speakers Committee any money, and postponed the requests of the Radio Station, and the Red Balloon."
I am touched by Mr. Naylor and Miss Haussamen's concern that all should tread the path of truth. But I fear that they, in their zeal, have themselves strayed from the straight and narrow. I cannot understand what the ambiguities were in my article, to which they refer in their recent letter to the Observer. Aside from a few flights of rhetorical fancy, I feel that my article was quite straightforward. They do not, in their letter, manage to deny the truth of either of the statements of mine which they claim to refute. The fact that all the members of Council approved of Mr. Edmonds' candidacy for the chairmanship does not alter the fact that no election was held and, hence, no votes were cast in his favor. The fact that Council has a Constitutional right to fill vacancies when they occur does not alter the fact that they executed their mandate 'dutifully' with little or no regard for the wishes of the electorate as expressed in the previous term's election. Let the subtext of my argument, stand, that Naylor and Miss Haussamen, I advocate a Constitutional reform which would establish a more democratic means of filling Council vacancies.

While I am on the subject of fact versus fiction. I should like to point out a few problems in this connection which have been known to trouble the Bard Observer, particularly in its most recent issue. The representative of the Observer who defended that publication's objectivity and standards of journalism before Council Monday night, in Athens, claimed that the Observer exhibited a minimal amount of bias and a high quality of writing.

Last semester, a statement appeared in the Observer which referred to the Gadfly as the "product of a closed mind." I have in my possession a list of 53 names of members of this community who have contributed either letters or articles to the Gadfly. This list will be published in the Gadfly next week.

The Observer's standards of journalism and quality of writing do not, apparently, extend to its headlines. In the most recent issue we find "news articles" headlined "ASSEMBLY DOUBTS STEA PRO. KISSLER RULING," "NOV: TO DISMISS OBSERVER "WON'T I II COUNCIL" (note how the Observer, in its august objectivity, devotes an entire separate article to its own request for funds, and then portrays the proceedings at Council as a sort of morality play in which the Forces of Good triumphed over the Forces of Evil), "SAGAR WOMEN PROD OF SORORITY," "CONTRIBUTION OF RULING DETERMINED BY SORORITY ON NO JUNIOR GUILD." I am astonished.
that Mr. Kahn ceased polemicizing long enough to give an accurate count of the vote at the Assembly meeting. I will not tire my readers by pointing out the preponderance of inflammatory editorializing in what purports to be a news medium, nor will I discuss the errors of fact and other omissions in the lead editorial. Although I would not question the right of any organization or individual to criticize the Gadfly, I would submit that the Observer's periodic fulminations regarding our humble publication would carry greater weight if it concerned itself more with evolving into a responsible news journal and less with the prostitution of its resources by certain highly vocal political fringe groups on campus.

Jeffrey T. Mortimer

THE NOTRE DAME SPIRIT HIT'S BARD

The Intramural Basketball season began with the Faculty team defeating Stone Row in a close battle. This reporter witnessed a masterful job of psychology by Faculty coach, William "Plato" Lensing. The game was a tense, close battle and as the teams came off the floor at halftime, the score was tie.

You could see by the expressions of the Faculty players' faces that they expected a tongue-lashing from their mentor, Coach Lensing. It was precisely then that this reporter learned that not only is Mr. Lensing a master of the philosophic arts, but he has also mastered the psychological sciences.

As he stood before his players with his face two shades redder than usual, he spoke: "Citizens! I stand before thee and I am prepared for the indignation and humiliation of which I am the object, but I know the causes. A man may personally be well off and yet, if his team is defeated, he is defeated with it. Think that the team has the right to your services in sustaining the honor of the Faculty. Why have thou played so badly!" At this point he paused and gazed coldly at his players: "O Zeus, king of the gods, what have I done to deserve this fate? If thou wilt that my star player, Terence Dewnap, breaks his leg, I'll buy this, but what have I done to deserve the wrath of all of the inhabitants of Mt. Olympus? Why are these BORs playing so badly?" With this, you could see his face lighten as if he had heard from his Oracle. Again he paused and said:

"Citizens, I say no more. It has been said before, but for your edification, I shall repeat... the Macedonians are coming! Let's win this one for Terrence Dewnap!"

At the last sound of his laconic speech, the players rose and with tears in their eyes, proceeded to win the game. It remains to be seen what Mt. Olympus has in store for the faculty team.

Stratus Patrickis

AT THE OTHER EXTREME

Last semester we Council-watchers applauded that body's efforts to create a little order out of its financial chaos. You will remember that that was the semester when Council initiated its "committed-sponsorship" policy, previously, all organizations would submit budgets to Council, literally overflowing with proposed lecture programs; Council would blithely hand over the Convocation funds to these groups, and only then with the money safely in their hot little fists did the organizations attempt to contact the speakers and arrange a speaking engagement. In most cases no preparations had been made, and the speakers approached for the first time could not fit Forum (or the Literature Club, or the Psych. Club, or the History Club, etc.) into their schedules. The result of this poor planning left Council with large cash reserves, the amount of which they could never be totally sure of until the very end of the semester. Last semester Council demanded that the organizations and clubs receiving money from Council present a list of committed speakers (that is, speakers committed for a particular date at a stipulated fee), to the budget committee before their recommended budget ever reached the Council floor.

That, however, was all past history. Now, it seems, the clubs have whole-heartedly adopted Council's policy of the committed speaker.

Groups like the literature club and Ecclesia et Collegium came before Council last Monday night with lists of speakers and other such financial commitments. Council has now moved to the other extreme. Because of the numerical proliferation of campus organizations and the limitations set by the fixed amount of Convocation dues, Council was forced to pare down drastically the financial requests of all the organizations. Many of the chairmen will have to return to their speakers and make excuses as to why now, after arrangements apparently have been settled, the club will have to cancel out of the agreement.

The clubs have kept their end of the Council dictum: they have arranged their programs and committed...
their speakers; it is up to Council to make its standards and eligibility for funds more clear. Either committed speakers are grounds for an allotment or they are not. If they are not, then Council must agree on some other standards by which they can arrive at an equitable decision.

Ilene Rosen

-------------------------------------------------------------
WHAT IS TO BE DONE OR WHETHER the WEATHER?

The issue at hand is not only a matter of meteorology, but one of the allocation of power and responsibility. Who has a more personal stake in and commitment to the weather, the students or the Weatherman?

The students' right to propose changes in the weather over-shadowed by the Weatherman's insistence on enacting and delaying those proposals—a duality of power has led to the present confusion of purpose. Are a few extra weeks of warmth and sunshine which give students the right to go to theoff campus the law worth compromising ourselves as responsible individuals? In order to get this far we have had to agree to accept a pledge; the pledge violated the principle of a secret ballot, and the vote turned the pledge into a bribe. The Weatherman has added hypocrisy to hypocrisy by asking us to promise to uphold the weather reports when it is apparent that the weather is obsolete.

We must consider the future and ask ourselves what our true purpose is. While we might not all agree on the form in which the Weatherman decided to establish a system of weather control which would run absolutely enough to free us to pursue extracurricular activities such as sunbathing and swimming. The first step toward such a system is to eliminate the present confusion by eliminating the duality of power, rather than vote on the present proposal we must offer the Weatherman a decision: either he does the creating, and becomes responsible for the success or failure of the weather, or we do.

If the Weatherman decided to take on the responsibility of the weather then it would remain pretty much the same as it is. In the mean time the community will continue to be buried under 2 feet of snow for the remainder of the semester.

If the Weatherman decided to give students the power to get up their own weather station then we might take the challenge of that responsibility and discover a sound system of producing the weather we want which would ultimately lead to a better community and a drier student body.

At a meeting last night the Chief Meteorologist made rather flip-pant remarks to the effect that a proposed community assembly could only achieve a quorum when the weather was a topic of consideration among all students. True as those remarks might be they show a lack of respect for the warmth of the community and for the students who do not like the cold, dank days of winter. If the Weatherman has so little regard for what is meaningful to us then how can we respect his forecasting.

IS THERE NO ONE IN THE COMMUNITY WHO WILL STAND UP FOR INTEGRITY AND HONEST DEALING?

JOIN US IN OUR REBELLION AGAINST THE WEATHERMAN

The members of the community are invited to a celebration of the Rites of Spring on the soccer field at high noon on the vernal equinox. The purpose of this Baal Ritual will be to demonstrate the student bodies.

Join us there for a mass demonstration protesting the manner in which the establishment has conducted the weather for the last 2 years.

This meeting is sanctioned by SUSH:
(The Student League, Uniting Sunshino and Health)
Maria Rich
Jeffrey Mortimer
Ilene Rosen
(based on an idea by Anne Hill)

"THE SCOURGE OF FORTUNE"

Rabelais said of his Pantagruel that he "never vexed nor disquieted himself with the least pretense of dislike to anything, because he must have most grossly abandoned the divine mansion of reason if he had permitted his mind to be never so little grieved, affected or altered on any occasion whatsoever." A singularly pertinacious fellow then, Pantagruel, or rather Rabelais, would have been a fit subject for lynching in this day. If the Roosevelts (including Eleanor) hadn't censured him for moral apathy back in the 30's, you can bet that Bobby Kennedy and the New Left would be hot on his tail today for "moral irresponsibility."

Unquestionably, this is an age of opinion, of emotional and intellectual commitment. Either one sounds off about anything or everything, either one "comes up with some good ideas," or he is banished to everyone to the limbo of unregenrable dulleards. This is even more the case at mandale-
on-Hudson. Could anyone hope to consider the casus Furoso surrounding social regulations with anything like Panteagarian equanimity? Never in your life. If Bruce Lieberman wouldn't put his finger on you for some kind of moral turpitude, then Harvey Fleetwood would have you for one of the "bad guys", or in his more lucid moments of insight and articulation -- "a reactionary deviationist." And if, in your heart you just can't bring yourself to believe that the administration is out to hoodwink us, then undoubtedly you suffer from some kind of glandular deficiency. In short, you just can't win. Throw up your hands, Panteagrianists, the odds are against you.

Skeptics to all ideas, including and especially our own, we have never suffered a pang when ideas of some other imbeciles prevail. It is impossible for us to get any light out of such hallucinations as "student rights" and "academic freedom." For if you pull out all the sludge which usually accompanies such protestations, you find that they are invariably grounded in the inferior man's hatred of the guy who has a bit more intelligence. There is one honest impulse behind the protest for "Student rights," and that is the impulse to punish the man with the superior capacity for study--to bring him down to the miserable level of a self-indulging buffoon; i.e., of a stupid, but ever-opinionated, ever-protesting, loud-mouth. And there is only one argument for academic freedom, and that is the argument that it free some of us from pedantics.

Panteagrianists, there are some resurgent moralizing Rabbits among us. Perhaps half, if not all the sororities of the world are caused by their false as ambitions. Witness their logic: hypocrisy is the cardinal sin to the moral life; social regulations breed hypocrisy; ergo, do away with social regulations. All in favor say "aye." Or try this on for size: Morally, the very rules which stifle free speech is indefensible; free speech was stilled last Wednesday night; ergo, to restore free speech, eliminate the rules. "Ah, me,"--to use Mr. Lensing's refrain.

But, note well, Panteagrianists, the buncombe travels not only with the performers. There exist other "virtuous" men, perhaps more officious in appearance (some in fact resemble Aldermen) who talk about "honorable commitments," they promise to serve the "community"--a conception which begins to resemble a version of the Emersonian Oversoul. By their standards, the responsibility for one's individual actions devolves not upon himself but the entire communal organism. Zum Beispiel, if I loose my nickel in the candy machine, I am to report the fact to Alderman Edmonds, pater communities, will promptly make good on it. To extrapolate this notion of communal responsibility, follow closely: If I disobey the social regulations, the responsibility for this action resides not with me (can you imagine HPC disciplining anyone?), but redounds upon the communal organism which has pledged its "good word" to the Trustees. Hence, punitive action for individual violations will be leveled against both the innocent and the guilty. Face it, Panteagrianists, you're included.

Clearly the failure of Bard's former system of social regulation is the failure of the House Presidents Committee. When violations occurred in the past, they met with slow, equivocal and diminutive response; and now the whole student body pays the price.

First, for having to endure Valpurgis Nacht, that meeting of the Assembly, for having to pledge a spurious oath of good faith to the Trustees, and finally, for having given a group of forty students the excuse to force an incident like the "sit-in". HPC had better take heed: either it takes proper disciplinary action against the forty violators of the "sit-in" fiasco, or they had better gotten to the hatchets for a stormy spring semester.

Perhaps, then, Panteagrianists, all we have to lose is our quality of spirit, which, as Bebelus said, consists in "a certain jollity of mind, pickled in the scorn of fortune."

John A. Paylor

The Gadfly would like to respectfully request that the Senior Class, as its gift to the college, gold plate the whistle that Miss Linda Foldt used to blow the deal on social regulations with the Administration.

The Gadfly would also like to welcome Miss Kathi Matthews, Miss Jane Graham, Miss Marisa High, and Mr. Robert Horgen to our fold. The staff continues with John Paylor, Jeffrey Iortimer, and Ilene Rosen acting as editors. Harjorie Tomkms and Stuart Green continue as assistant editors. We also wish to thank Stratus Patrackis who is, in actuality, Mr. Charles Patrick, Director of physical education and athletics.

Please turn to P.6 or a SPECIAL GOODGUTS VS. BAD GUTS BLOT.
ELECT YOUR FAVORITE GOOD-GUY AND BAD-GUY!!! CHOOSE ONE FROM EACH COLUMN.

After a careful tabulation of the results, the winners will be announced and will immediately become eligible for official GOOD-GUY and BAD-GUY sweatshirts. All contributions towards the purchase of said sweatshirts would be greatly appreciated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FOR THE OFFICIAL GOOD-GUY</th>
<th>FOR THE OFFICIAL BAD-GUY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jeff Rochlis</td>
<td>Bruce Bieberman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Edmonds</td>
<td>Harvey Fleetwood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andy Krieger</td>
<td>Linda Boldt</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

And the entire cast of HPC

Runners-up will choose up sides and continue to play Cowboys-and-Indians.

- Ilene Rosen
- Mercia Rich