

Bard College
Student Newspaper Archive
(1895-1999)

All Rights Reserved. Copyright © 1999 by Bard College

BARDIAN

Vol. 1 No. 10 May 27, 1949

Page 1	“Old Bachelor” Reviewed Hoddeson Cultural Crisis Discussed Hansi Blumenfeld Confusion, Contradiction and Calamity Ralph Dale Schley Art at Bard Amero
Page 2	Letters to the Editors [“ . . .I must withdraw any future support I might offer to the school if Dr. Reis is not retained.”] Robert Corregan [“Only if Council members and the students think that student opinion in faculty reappointments is important will the Administration’s campaign of weariness be defeated.”] Travis L. Houser [“To cast slurs at or to throw out light, candles, must mean you are an advocate of the muck of darkness.”] Harold Wolfe Editorial [“Is there any need for qualified professional men to be vague when they have at their command all the means to be clear?”] Letter from Mr. Hayes [“And it came to pass in the fourteenth year of Drab. . . that the innocents. . .said let us see this thing that is called dining commons and what manner of people dwell within.”] Ernest Hayes
Page 4	On God at Bard David Egerwald
Page 5	Supplement to the Bardian to be Held in Conjunction with the Editorial Letter to Louise Tachau, Chairman of the Students’ Educational Policy Committee [“The main purpose of the document of 8/16/48 was to pronounce a policy of standards of quality.”] Stefan Hirsch

"old bachelor" reviewed

Last week the Drama department presented us with Congreve's *The Old Bachelor*. It might be more polite to say that they treated us to a performance of the play, since the acting was competent to excellent, the sets were extraordinary, and the costumes as striking as Bard can produce. Unfortunately, as will become obvious, we cannot.

The outstanding moment of the play (aside from the opening of the curtain on Bill Pitken's sets) was provided by Dolores Kemper and Joel Fields. As a winning and hypocritical slut, Dolores combined broad (and low) comedy with charm to create the best-acted and funniest scene in the play. Joel Fields, playing opposite her in the classic role of cuckolded husband, was suitably addled and credulous—and genuinely funny. Next in line for honors was William Walker, whose stage business as a harebrained nobleman was wonderful, and Olga Churek was, as usual, excellent. Al Haulenbeek turned in another of his slick and competent portrayals as the gay blade, Bellmour, and Pete Stone was adequate as Vainlove, although he seemed somewhat ill at ease. Rip Archer showed the most notable improvement over his previous performances in his portrayal of the soured old bachelor, Hartwell, but Jay Smith as Captain Bluff was badly handicapped by miscasting. Richard Burns as a pimp was so well costumed that he needed to put forth no particular effort to fill out his role. He realized it. Virginia Gaines was sweet enough as Araminta, Joan Abner suitably affected as Belinda, and the others fulfilled their functions well enough.

It is unfortunate that one cannot work up more enthusiasm than this for what was certainly the best executed play Bard has had this year, and it takes a little searching to discover why. There is, of course, the play. It became a little tiresome after three acts (two to go) to hear string after string of polished dirty jokes. My capacity for smut is practically inexhaustible, but there is an end. And it seems rather useless to devote the energy and force of the whole department to produce such a play. This is not to suggest that *The Old Bachelor* was done simply because it was dirty—there is more to Congreve than that. Unfortunately it consists of a revelation of a completely valueless frivolity which finds expression in one hypocritical game after another. Somehow, in spite of the laughter, the play leaves a bad taste. And not because Congreve is a satirist. It was simply his idea of good clean fun.

There are, of course, two primary ways to consider a choice of plays at Bard. First in importance is the necessity for providing training for Drama majors. Trailing sloppily second is the idea that the theatre, at Bard and elsewhere, has something to say. I do not think that this play fulfilled either function. The type of acting that *The Old Bachelor* demands requires a suave gloss which comes only with experience, and to really go over, an enormous charm and presence which very few actors possess. And the play itself has little to say—except that dirty jokes are immortal. The other plays which have been performed at Bard this year are equally open to reproach. *The Flies*, which provided us, along with *Mary of Scotland*, with an all-too-liberal dose of the apparently widespread pseudo-classic element in modern theatre, did little else, and the four scenes that were presented at the beginning of the term can only be charitably considered when one remembers that they were "workshop" productions. And this has been the lot.

The point of all this is that there are plays—a great many of them—which are of more assistance in an actor's training, and which have something to say. We might try a little Shakespeare some of Chekhov's comedies, and perhaps a little O'Neill, for example. To say nothing of the idea that Bard theatre, which does not have to consider anything but its own taste, is free to do work which is as experimental as it desires.

Hoddeson

cultural crisis discussed

Last week-end, the week-end of the 6th of May, Bard was honored by the presence of two distinguished men, Mr. Myron Shapiro and Dr. Paul Tillich, who came here for the express purpose of discussing the "Cultural Crisis of Our Time."

The speakers were introduced by Mr. Stefan Hirsch, head of the art department, in the absence of President Fuller. The floor was first yielded to Mr. Shapiro.

Mr. Shapiro's lecture concerned itself primarily with the crisis in art. He stated that there are a great number of people today who find art unintelligible; this unintelligibility is proclaimed to constitute the existing crisis. Most naturally the artist feels that "there is something wrong" with those who cannot understand him, just as the layman who looks at the artist's work and fails to comprehend, considers the former at fault. We have therefore a situation in which the artist is rejected by society as a whole; an artist who, in turn, no longer feels himself to be a part of that society.

In connection with the estrangement of the artist from his society, Mr. Shapiro stated that many artists align themselves with Fascist, Communist and similar groups, because of this very state of estrangement and the consequent feeling of insecurity. (Under Communism, for example, the artist is not only guaranteed his livelihood, but also is given a solidarity with the destination of the country; and a set of instructions, which, because they are common to all in his field, afford a measure of certainty as to the acceptability of his work.) Two interrelated questions now present themselves: first, has a new work of art always been rejected, and secondly if it has not, what then are the peculiar factors which lead to the rejection of new art.

(Continued on page three)

confusion, contradiction and calamity

Very possibly this is too ambitious an undertaking for a newspaper article, but the reason for it is one which I believe legitimate. First, I feel that some sort of a comprehensive examination of the institution we graciously call our 'community government' is pressingly necessary. Ever since the activities of Fred Segal's committee, of which I was a member, last Spring, there have been innumerable groups, organizations and committees, with their correlative questionnaires, petitions and suggested amendments, which have succeeded in little more than tying the Bard Community into ambiguous knots. Mere flashlights have been spotted on Bard, only illuminating certain aspects of an over-all problem. A flood-light is desperately needed. Secondly, the comprehensive view which I hope to present should be available to all members of the community, not abortively discussed in Council or Convocation, and not pigeonholed with sociological questionnaires. Hence, *The Bardian* has been chosen as the method of communication.

Setting about to codify the cumulative laws, in the hope that the fewer the laws, the better they would be known, the Constitutional Committee found that some now on the books are really not laws at all. In searching for a common denominator to this somewhat delicate problem, it was found that it could best be approached by means of the 'all that pertains to the Administration will receive the status of a suggestion' doctrine. But, no generality is ever complete in the particular, it merely serves as a line of approach. There are but few cases of pure black or white in law, mostly innumerable shades of grey. The problem here is the question of legislative jurisdiction. What is the ambit of the power of the Community Council? It is with this question that they have been

(Continued on Page Two)



"ON GOD AT BARD" (see page four)

bardian

the

The Bardian is the official student publication of Bard College, Annandale-on-Hudson, New York. The opinions expressed in this official publication are those of the writers. It is also financed by student funds.

MAY 27, 1949

VOL. 1, No. 10



art at bard

For some reason we at Bard have been exposed during the past few weeks to a terrific splurge of theory and expression about the artist and his relation to this, that, and the other thing. The world has been described as rotten or in a state of crisis, and the artist displayed as crying for reform or calling man to repentance. Our artists, our would-be artists, the various people about who do not qualify as either but simply like art, and the rest of us have been left in a state of bewilderment.

There are few things that we can say about our feelings before paintings, poems, plays and music without running into a crowd of objectors who sneer at our remarks and imply that we are sadly missing the boat. The intellectualizers somehow seem to get in front of us with their willingness to explain, to expound, and to drift; and, if we do not do the same, we are sadly lost, regrettably philistine, and hopelessly blind.

Surely we have all had artistic experiences at one time or another in our lives when we have been thrilled perhaps unaccountably by the way in which a thing has been done; but few of us talk about such things; few of us want to. All we want as art appreciators is to continue to have such moments of elation and satisfaction and to continue to feel that the artist who gives them to us is honest and himself shares in the hallowed feeling which is transmitted to us.

Dante describes an artistic experience of his own in Canto XII lines 61-69, of the *Purgatorio*, when he sees sculptured reliefs on the pavement of a terrace.

I saw Troy gaping and in ashes laid.

O Ilion, thee how vile and desolate

The witness of the sculpture there betrayed!

What master of brush or point were he so great,

Who line and shade could have so justly wed

For every subtle mind to wonder at?

The live appeared living, and dead the dead.

Not better he who saw the actual deed

Saw than I, stooping, all beneath my tread.

The tribute to art as a real record of felt experience can be found over and over again in art. It is common to such widely separated people as John Keats, Lady Murasaki, Henry James, Rainer-Maria Rilke, Braque and Picasso. Though Mr. Shapiro, the critic who recently spoke at Bard, might not agree, the artistic experience is in itself alone the most important value of art, for it is only in this experience that all the ages can meet together and provide man with a common bond of sensitivity that can surmount time and place.

The fact that one can have an exciting imaginative and emotional experience in Congreve, even in *The Old Bachelor*, his most amateurish comedy, makes this play a vital example of comic expression and imbues even its dirty jokes with color and its characters with force. With all due respects to the different opinion of the drama reviewer in this issue, I found *The Old Bachelor* exciting not because of its super-abundance of dirty jokes, but because the jokes grow out of a situation which is fundamentally comic and out of a period when men could laugh at themselves and see in plays such as this their own caricature.

There is no reason why every person at Bard College cannot enjoy the "true, good, and beautiful" as it is embodied in the art of man yesterday, today, and tomorrow—in the works of such men as Michel-Angelo, Wycherley, or Melville. This "good" has nothing to do with machines, morals, psychoanalysis, or, in a word, intellectualism. This "good" has nothing to do with crisis, but is always and everywhere an affirmation that man is invincible and that crises are small affairs to be surmounted by a

(Continued on Page Two)

letters to the editors

May 9, 1949

TO the Editor of the Bardian:

I feel that my interest in Bard is sincere, and for that reason I wish to express my sentiments on an issue I believe to be of great importance.

Dr. Reis was one of the finest teachers under whom I have ever studied. He represents a formidable force in the social studies division and is a good influence on the student body as a whole. Since a college should be concerned with a faculty member in his function as a teacher, and Dr. Reis is known to be excellent in this respect, I can only conclude that Bard is no longer interested in keeping good teachers on its staff. This also seems to imply that Bard is no longer interested in education.

As an alumnus who is asked to support Bard in its activities, I feel that I can no longer make the claim that the college is an excellent academic institution if the trend is to release outstanding teachers. For this reason, I must withdraw any future support I might offer to the school if Dr. Reis is not retained.

Sincerely,

Robert Corregan
Bard College
11 May, 1949

* * *

To the Editor:

Late Monday night, 2 May, 1949, Magnus Homestead was having an earnest discussion with Dr. Fuller in Community Council. The Council members clearly showed their impatience that the Reis-Koenig affair was being discussed again. Dr. Garvan stalked out of the meeting, and in the midst of Homestead's discussion, the Council adjourned.

Why is Council and a large share of the faculty and student body weary of the Reis-Koenig affair? I said in the first Council meeting this year that the Administration would bandy about the question of faculty reappointments, and would do nothing. I feel my prediction is now fact, and that the Administration is directly responsible for this state of weariness. Only if Council members and the students think that student opinion in faculty reappointments is important will the Administration's campaign of weariness be defeated. Only then, will a solution be possible.

Yours truly,

Travis L. Houser

* * *

A LETTER TO THE BARDIAN

by Harold Wolfe

Mr. Bob MacAlister

I would like to borrow a word from your letter signed "The Enlightened."

A candle is a most important object in the darkness. It supplies light; something which our community desperately needs. To cast slurs at or to throw out light, candles, must mean you are an advocate of the muck of darkness.

When Hitler rose to power one of his first acts was to burn all the bibles, all the books and classical works of enlightenment. He burned them but the light from those fires was certainly not a brightness.

Have you ever tried to drive down to Mike's in a very dark, starless night without the use of headlights? Have you ever tried to open a door without the proper key? When we disparage light when we snub out lights in the darkness, we very rarely, if ever, reach that toward which we grope.

the unenlightened

LOOKING FOR GOOD FOOD?

When in Red Hook

Visit

ANDY'S
Restaurant

two

editorial

Lately a folder has been circulated to the members of the EPC. It was written by Mr. Artinian, Dr. Fuller, Dr. Garrett, Mr. Hirsh, and Mr. Rosen. These teachers and administrative officers have attempted to state the general Bard policy. We would like to cite a part of these proposals, and show how they are confusing, ambiguous, and unworthy of the men who wrote them.

In respect to the Community Life, the following was said:

"Some students will be community leaders, actively participating in Community organizations and management. Others will be good citizens by peacefully pursuing their private enterprises. (No pressure should be exerted on these to force their participation in various organizations.) None will be 'Individualists' to the point of anarchy and continual disturbance centers—such indication of continued great emotional instability will also constitute a basis for separation from the college."

Some may argue that the proposal is a truism; that organizations at Bard have always been on a voluntary basis, that law-breakers have always been expelled if they continue to misbehave. Is there any need, they ask, to become concerned over this restatement of Bard's social aims? No, indeed, there is nothing so radically different in this from previous statements of this kind.

But we question this interpretation. We are especially concerned with the last statement which is: "None will be Individuals to the point of anarchy and continual disturbance centers—such indication of continued great emotional instability will also constitute a basis for separation from the college."

First of all, the statement refers to no existing body of laws, but seems to stand by itself as a new law. Where, in the Cumulative Community Laws do we find any law about emotional instability or people who are continual disturbance centers? No such terms can be found among our existing laws. And yet this is a vital question—what constitutes expulsion? In other words, no overall statement has been made up until now about the grounds for expelling students. Why, at this time, is such a blanket statement needed?

The commonly accepted definition of an anarchist is one who opposes existing governments because they support class distinctions and privileges. In other words, anarchy is a political term applying to people with certain political views. Therefore, it seems strange that this term should be used in a statement of Bard's social aims. If law-breaker was meant by the word anarchy, why wasn't it used? Why use a word with political connotations at a time when the Bard campus is in the midst of an important political battle?

It is a dangerous logical mistake to talk about 'emotional instability' and continual disturbance centers in connection with separation from college. Separation from college means expulsion and expulsion means 'to be kicked out.' Should a student be 'kicked out' because he is 'emotionally unstable?' We think not. For emotional instability, continuous or momentary, is not a criminal offense. It is merely a state of mind which is outside of the realm of punishment or condemnation. Only psychiatrists who have studied the mind for many years can make intelligent statements about emotional instability. Certainly neither law-breakers nor policy-makers are in a position to analyze students who they think are emotionally unstable. For they are incompetent at such things.

The gentlemen who made these proposals might argue at this point that they did not mean to drag psychiatry into their statements. They would say, "You know very well what we mean; we are referring to people who ring fire-bells and who damage Bard property and who drive recklessly around the Bard campus."

Why, we ask, don't you say what you mean—and say it in terms whose meanings are not obscure? Is there any need for qualified professional men to be vague when they have at their command all the means to be clear? For instance,

there is the phrase 'continual disturbance centers.' We are familiar with it because we read or hear the weather reports where it is used extensively: Disturbance centers were recorded today over the Great Lakes region—a cold area will develop etc. To borrow the phrase from the weather bureau, and apply it to the Bard social scene is quite amusing: People who are stormy, or who have the appearance of a storm, and continue to show a cloudy aspect, should be asked to leave the college.

In conclusion, we would like to say that this folder is not worthy of the gentlemen who wrote it. Granted that it is a "flexible" statement of Bard policy. But it is "flexible" in the worst sense of the word. And what practical use can this folder have when it causes confusing and conflicting interpretations?

staff

Thomas Channing Woodbury
(Editor)

Richard Amero, Fred Segal
(Associate Editors)

Business: Donald Walker, Ralph Schley, John Segal, Barbara Miner, Frank Gambee.

Don Gellert, Deborah Sussman
(Make Up)

News and Feature: David Egardwald, Kit Kauders, David Hoddison, Pete Stone, Emil Strasner, Magnus Holmstead, Yvonne Zacharias, Robert MacAlister.

Iris Lipskar (Circulation Department)

letter from mr. hayes

"And they that fed them fled . . . and told everything . . ." (Matt. 8:33)

And it came to pass in the fourteenth year of Drab and of Coeducation the fifth that the innocents thereof rose up and said let us see this thing that is called dining commons and what manner of people dwell therein. So they arose and entered in and behold there were sundry sons of Drab disporting themselves withal. And they made their hearts merry, pouring out the milk of the beasts of the field, and casting forth the bread that their strength and skill had wrought into pellicules, and calling one to another, and great was the noise and merriment thereof even to the uttermost parts of the commons. And one approached and said let it be taken easy that others may eat in peace and refresh their souls to the labors of love and of work. But the sundry sons said what is it of thy business. Is not this Drab wherein every man doeth that which is right in his own eyes and hearkeneth not to another, neither sheweth he lovingkindness to the comfort of another. May not one of Drab gad whither he listeth and make his mark where he will and it so please him. So they would not be persuaded. Whereupon some of the innocents said one to another let us arise and go hence and enter not again into the gates of commons while such an one existeth upon the face of the earth. But others said let be peradventure they will grow up. Now the rest of their acts which they did and their wisdom, are they not written in the book of the acts of the committee thereunto appointed.

Ernest Hayes

art at bard

(Continued from Page One)

"vision, hope, and gleam" which can say "yes" even when all men are saying "no." There is not a person at this college who cannot arrive at his "Peak in Darien" and not an artist, be he actor, musician, painter, sculptor, or writer, who by concentrating on himself and his own imaginative apparatus cannot convey to another the moment of silence and surrender which is the essence of his art. If we will grant art its own autonomous value instead of apologizing unnecessarily for its existence, then it may mean something to us for what it is, and not for what we ridiculously want it to be, technically, morally, or socially.

Amero

confusion

(Continued from Page One)

continuously burdening themselves. They are weekly engrossed in the more delicate shades of grey, a pastime which has been occupying more and more of their Monday evenings. It has been an all too necessary accompaniment of the all too obvious trend away from progressivism. The Council finds itself increasingly aware of the fact that their power and effectiveness have been sliced, but they know not from where. Although it might be here ventured that the writer feels this trend to have grown from a firm reliance and stern insistence on the doctrine of 'social responsibility,' one which leads to plausible dialectics, yet one which likewise leads to a 'Deans Government' if pushed too far, he will refrain from comment, as it is not directly to the point. The Council, unable to detect the almost imperceptible shades from one another by means of parliamentary procedure, is unable to advise its several committees within this area of grey of their function and responsibilities to the community as a whole. A recent example of this is the Dining Room Committee. The chairman of this committee, a position which was an honor a few years ago, came to Council with a few suggestions, only to find a terrific confusion as to whether the suggestions should become laws, be posted, or simply recommend to the Dietician due to the fact that the kitchen and dining hall were her domain and she could do whatever she wanted therein. The problem, after being discussed for a valuable 45 minutes, which really amounts to something when multiplied by the number present, was finally referred to the Constitutional Committee in the hope that it could find a way through the fog.

The jurisdictional problem is basic. It is not enough recognized, nor properly understood. If Council knew what it was to do aside from acting in the capacity of distributing agent for some \$3,000 per semester—this being at present the only substance which has the effect of binding it into any semblance of unity—it could go about its business in an orderly fashion, know what it was about, and at the same time create a feeling of respect, thereby engendering an interest in our government.

The problem does exist, but merely to recognize it is not enough. It must be cured. To do this we must find out why it is with us; in other words, where does it come from? This is roughly the mental process of all thinking members of Council when confronted with a particular problem of jurisdiction. Although they outwardly ask the aforementioned question, does this bit of proposed legislation constitute an infringement of the necessary authority of the Administration, the real question they inwardly ask, the answer to which is the real one, is one which they are all quite guilty of repressing, naively or otherwise. In reality the limit of jurisdiction is determined by the question: does this apply to just students? A law is within the scope of our government's power when it pertains only to the student body and outside when it does not. Yet even in this sphere its jurisdiction is gradually, but ever so surely, shrinking. The 'Open House' will inevitably fall prey to the doctrine of 'social responsibility.' But wait! Is there not here a basic confusion? We have proudly labeled our government a 'Community Government,' one which theoretically governs the 'Community.' All districts of the 'Community' are represented; but, why are only the students governed, and even then, not completely or efficiently by it? If it is to be, as it undeniably is, a government of the students, and for the students, why not then a government by the students?

There are those who would shy away from such a thought. But, as any departure from existing conditions is generally met apprehensively by at least a small group of those concerned, it is well to examine the consequences of this departure.

The first thing to realize is that it is not a radical departure. It merely

(Continued on Next Page)

confusion

(Continued from Page Two)

recognizes present conditions and attempts to adjust itself accordingly. Its message can best be summed up with the aphorism, "Let's stop kidding ourselves."

By recognizing reality, Convocation and its executive committee, Council, would, for the first time in its history of confusion, contradiction and calamity, know just what its duties and powers are. It would then be able to state to its various committees just what constitutes their respective delegated duties and powers. This would undoubtedly stimulate an increase in the interest of our government. The Convocation, Council and the committees would be looked upon as more than gatherings of people and a sham; they would be viewed as working organs of a government that worked. The days of being a 'sucker' for volunteering your services to our government would be over; you would be elected and be proud of it. A relatively insignificant, but yet appealing point, is that Council and Convocation meetings would be considerably shortened because everyone would know why he was there.

It is appalling to note that with all of our existing organizations which are either for students, or to govern students, there is not a single one representative of student opinion. The student body has been merged into a nebulous mass with no voice of their own. At Council, where the students form a clear majority, it is obvious that the decisions reached there are not those of student opinion. Under our present 'Community' government it will never be possible to do away with the influence which those members of the Administrative and Faculty group undeniably exert in the legislative process. This condition exists, and will always exist, due to the fact that some students will continue to sacrifice their own views when found to be in opposition to the above mentioned Administrative and Faculty group, and when they are put in the position of declaring their opposition by open vote. This is very rarely done for the purpose of 'boot-licking,' it is rather the result of a feeling of reverence—a feeling of confidence. Also, if there is a particular measure that this group does not wish to see passed, it is relatively simple for it to be thwarted by creating confusion with the old problem, the one with which this article is concerned, that of 'jurisdiction,' or by appeal to the doctrine of 'social responsibility,' the force of the latter lying in our susceptibility to anything which even has the appearance of democratic justice. A student government would reach its own decisions in matters which effect the students. Its power would technically be the same as that of the community government; its acts would be subject to Presidential veto. Upon consideration, however, it would be considerably enhanced. By laying claim to the right to govern in all that pertains to student activities, and by legislating therein, we would have a definite and single voice in all these matters. Every time the student government acted, it would present the President of the College with student opinion, and he would be forced to consider it and to either use his veto power or not. The decision of vetoing and going against student opinion would be his only method of disapproval. There would be no more gradual re-moulding from within. The frequency of the use of his veto power would remain to his discretion but at the same time it would be under surveillance by the students.

For those who still might be in doubt as the efficacy, desirability and need of a basic governmental change, a statement by our college President concerning the confusion extant in our 'Community Government' should suffice. When, during the hearings of Fred Segal's aforementioned investigating committee, he was asked point blank where the power was, he threw up his hands and exclaimed, "God knows where the power lies until an issue comes up!" This deplorable situation must be cured; and, a 'Student Government' is the only lasting solution.

Ralph Dale Schley

cultural crisis discussed

(Continued from Page One)

Mr. Shapiro's answer to the first was in the negative. He stated that the phenomena of rejection has only manifested itself within approximately the last one hundred years. The theme of modern art, he said, is individual experience. It is his own personal world that the artist is most concerned with; and he lays great stress upon the perceptions, subtle experiences and free associations which he portrays by utilizing various devices of color, line form and arrangement. However, these devices are not common to all artists, but differ from one to another. During the Renaissance and the Reformation and in prior times, art was a function of the state, as it is in Russia today, and the artist was in possession of group symbols. With the advent of the French Revolution and the transformation in the concept of the role of the individual who was gaining an ever increasing importance, the artist no longer was tied to institutions and rituals which were not to be criticized, but was free to inquire into and to deal with an infinite variety of things. However, the trend towards greater individualization of the human being brought on by the Democratic Revolution was counteracted by the Industrial Revolution, which occurred simultaneously with the former, and which in turn led to a higher degree of mechanization by creating the necessity for the division of labor. Therefore the artist in his revolt against mechanization is turning increasingly into himself, portraying his subject matter in a dream-like manner rather than in a naturalistic one. His art embodies the ideals of freedom and individual expression which are professed by our society, but which are not adhered to.

The essential point in Mr. Tillich's speech was that man's greatness and man's greatest danger lie within one and the same thing—his power to create himself. He stated that the crisis of today is the crisis of the man who has lost himself in his creations—a situation brought about by the economic, political and social aspects of our time. Man has created a world of objects, he said, determined by science and techniques of which he has made himself a part. As an example of this, Tillich gave psychology and existential philosophy, which attempt to relegate man to the world of objects. He stated that the only hope for man is the realization of the threefold nature of his situation. First, that he has lost himself; second, that he is in constant revolt against his self loss, which manifests itself in the realm of the arts and to some extent in all the realms of life; and third, that this revolt is more or less a defeat of man.

Thus, the ultimate concern of our society must be to give man back to himself. —Hansi Blumenfeld

For the Best in Movies

THEATRES

Lyceum

Starr

Red Hook

Rhinebeck

Coming Attractions

The Setup
El Paso
Kiss In The Dark
Enchantment
Return of October
Barkleys of Broadway
Streets of Laredo
Ma and Pa Kettle

WHY GO ELSEWHERE?

Take advantage of
personal advice!

... bring your
insurance problems
to

Ralph Dale Schley
YOUR CAMPUS BROKER

IDLE HOUR INN

dinners:
pork chops
lamb chops
steaks

bard band every week:
Every other Friday Night
Every other Saturday Night

The
BARD
COLLEGE
STORE

To Speed Service —

Please Bring dishes back to counter

COMMUNITY
GARAGE

Dodge and Plymouth

Dodge Trucks

Storage - Repairs

- and -

Accessories - Towing

East Market Street

RHINEBECK, N. Y.

Telephone 244

HAROLD'S
snack bar

at the fork in the road

complete fountain service

sealtest products

kosher delicatessen

complete choice of sandwiches

prompt service

and

reasonable prices

ON GOD AT BARD

One of the few problems outside of our immediate community which seems to interest most students is that of God. We show in our large, and crowded religion classes a profound desire to explore what men of other ages have thought about God, and we pack St. Stephens Club lectures to hear informed current opinion. Yet, even on Sunday morning, the services in chapel are attended by mere handfulls. Poor attendance at Chapel has led many to say that an apathy or disbelief in God exists in a group as intellectual as comparative college norms reveal Bard to be. The seemingly conflicting facts on Chapel attendance and religious interest as shown in classes and lectures are perplexing to visitors and parents. Some say we attend lectures and classes in order to explore God from a purely academic point of view; and therefore we find it unnecessary to attend Chapel.

Accordingly, in order to reach a true picture of the state of religion at Bard, this writer has spoken to many students and faculty on campus. Those who do not believe in God, or who merely doubt the existence of God are remarkably few in numbers; and in even these, there is a certain interest in God. While not necessarily a purely intellectual study, this interest sometimes manifests itself in aesthetic, moral or humanitarian interests in God. Those who exhibit the aesthetic interest are interested in Him only in so far as those institutions dedicated to Him, regardless of creed, serve to convey beauty into a sordid world. Moralists among us hold that the church and belief is of value in that it provides a basis for the indoctrination of ethical codes. A few feel that God is interesting in that He fills a basic human need by providing a central purpose for life, and that roots are thereby added to a terrifying, and increasingly complex society. This aggregate of varied interests in God at Bard seems in the minds of some of our more broad theological students to herald a rebirth of religion at Bard. Yet, local theologians look even more favorably upon the the recent renaissance of Chapel interest within their own group. Few of us realize the importance of the Chapel in the lives of some of our fellow students. The Chapel is a daily place of worship for some of our theological students, and a weekly place of worship for all, as well as at least ten of our other fellow students. Their numbers are few; their devotion, sincere and unhearsed. The increase in the number and types of services marks the end of apathy among at least those few who are vitally interested in Chapel. This year has seen confirmation classes, litanies, vespers, daily prayer services, and choral services again held in quantities unparalleled since the days of St. Stephens. Prayers to God were recited during every Lenten sundown. Sunday Chapel services have been continued, despite dissapointing reception and the most trying practical conditions as to clergy.

Whether or not the services of a devoted few are better, or more acceptable to God than that of many indifferent parishoners, I shall not attempt to say. Nevertheless, the community service can not be construed as a community service when a round dozen worshippers is the exception rather than the rule. If there is an interest in God here why is there so little interest in Chapel? Many students have also been queeried to determine the reason for this lack of interest.

In answer to many of the reasons stated, I would say this: if we want to rest Sunday morning why do we frequent the store at that time? If we have been forced to attend Sunday School and found it dull and boring why don't we work to make a living church inspire a truly educational Sunday School? Can we really say that we find attending Chapel inconvenient?

Other students, in answer to a question on their non attendance, report that though they have read that this is a community service they still do not feel welcome. The usage of the Episcopal Church is based on the Anglican Tradition which dates back to the Days of the Apostles. The scriptures are read

four

from the Authorized or King James Version of the Bible, and the Book of Common Prayer is used for the service because it has stood the test of years of continuous use, and is universally regarded as one of the most beautiful, and gracious of prayer books. It was adopted in 1591, but has been kept up to date remarkably well. The welcome mat in the Chapel is out to all according to even the most rabid, and narrow of Episcopalian clergy. The claim that Chapel ritual is offensive to some religious bodies is not bourne out because Unitarians, Roman Catholics, and Jews have attended services here, and have expressed pleasure with both the usage, and the conduct of the services.

Many suggestions have been made for the improvement of Chapel attendance, and a short listing of them here might help reveal the breath of interests which a really vital Chapel can serve. The services themselves might be improved by a more well organized sermon series, and a more diversified selection of clergy. Aesthetically, more clearly defined programs of choral work, and organ recitals as integral parts of the services should be encouraged, and good publicity given to these performances. Sermon topics which call forth student interest should be encouraged, and a recording, and broadcast over WXBC of outstanding sermons should be attempted. Confirmation, church history and bible classes should be increased and continued. The fact that many magnificent speakers are brought here by the St. Stephens Society should be recognized. The work of Chapel Associates should be publicized, and expanded. Social and forum clubs should be established in connection with the Chapel.

Most of all it is important to keep in mind that a Chapel is more than a building. It is a center for religion, and as a center for religion low attendance figures are not the whole story of success or failure for Chapel. For if we do not have a love of God in our hearts, and a will to practice the Golden Rule in our every day lives, not all the attendance figures in the world can make the Chapel of the Holy Innocents a living church once more.

David Egerwald

SPRING LAKE LODGE

Swim from a float
Rowboats: 50c per hour
Fishing, Dining, Dancing
Beer, Wine, Liquor

Stop in for a good time

AUCOCK'S
COLONIAL STORE

Groceries
Fruits
Vegetables
Meats

DELIVERY SERVICE
Red Hook, N. Y.

RED
HOOK
LUNCH

TRY OUR HAMBURGERS

Open All Night

ANNANDALE
HOTEL

THE
RHINEBECK
DINER

Largest and Most Modern
Diner in the State

OPEN 24 HOURS DAILY

NEW ENCLOSED
BANQUET HALL

T. Djinis, Prop.

MILLARD & SON

WHOLESALE DISTRIBUTORS OF

Reynolds' Reliance and

Mill-son Food Products

POUGHKEEPSIE, N. Y.

For the Best in Taxi Service

Call Red Hook 165

BARD COLLEGE
TAXI

GEO. F. CARNRIGHT

Call from either the Rhinebeck
or Barrytown Stations

Tel. 165 RED HOOK, N. Y.

BEEKMAN ARMS

Oldest Hotel in America

RHINEBECK, N. Y.

"THE RENDEZVOUS OF FRIENDS"

Read
THE
RHINEBECK
GAZETTE

THE RED HOOK
FLORAL CO.

15 E. Market St., Red Hook, N. Y.

We Deliver
"Flowers By Wire"
Anywhere

Watches -:- Clocks

Pen and Pencil Sets

Costume Jewelry

Gifts for All Occasions

The HAEN
Jewelry Shop

Rhinebeck, N. Y. Tel. 8

SUPPLEMENT TO THE BARDIAN TO BE READ IN CONJUNCTION WITH
THE EDITORIAL

Editor's Note:

To clarify possible misinterpretation of the recent "What We're Up to" statement, the E.P.C. invited the authors of the article to its meeting last Tuesday. Because of the Psychology Panel which the members of E.P.C. felt they should attend, the meeting was cut short, and the invitation to the faculty members was cancelled. However, Mr. George Rosen and Mr. Stefan Hirsch sent letters to E.P.C. explaining their points of view. With Mr. Hirsch's permission we print his letter.

May 23, 1949.

Miss Louise Tachau, Chairman
Students' Educational Policy Committee

Dear Tach:

Just in case the meeting-rich schedule should make my attendance impossible I would like to express myself as co-author about the part of the document of August 16, 1948 which has been attacked anonymously on the bulletin board.

First I would like to say that the plaintiff's admission of our good intentions is the only thing which makes me respond to his unsigned manifesto. Secondly that the atmosphere of hysteria and fear rampant on the campus is almost the only justification for his having written the letter. The facts behind this mass psychosis are other than they are alleged to be as I shall point out further below. Since this psychosis, however, exists I am willing to join in an effort to re-word the objectionable paragraph if others are equally impressed with the advisability of such action for the sake of peace. The anonymous writer overlooked of course the fact that the document of 8/16/48 was up for re-discussion and that you, Madam Chairman, were a member of the committee which was to discuss Student-Faculty relations, that he could have apprized you of his fears and urged you to bring this to thorough discussion. Why he chose the objectionable way of offending some of his friends on the faculty is something about which I will have a few words further on too.

The main purpose of the document of 8/16/48 was to pronounce a policy of standards of quality. It concerned itself rather explicitly with the question of what kind of students should be admitted to the college and what kind of students should be separated from it. Non-performance of academic duties or below par performance of them or dishonesty in performance would seem to be acceptable reasons for such separation. Since there had been a tendency on the part of some members of the faculty and administration to consider active participation in non-academic community enterprises a requirement for at least the awarding of scholarships, we the authors of the document wrote into it the objectionable paragraph in which we tried to define the upper and lower limits of participation in such non-academic activities and, I think, we were extremely generous about non-participation. It seems to be clear, on the other hand, that no community can tolerate in its midst individuals whose only contribution to the social life of the community is a constant disturbing of the peace and it was a clear corollary of the parenthesis on non-participation that something had to be said about over-participation of a broadly disturbing sort.

In this connection I would like to point out that there has really been no reason for the fears implied in the anonymous letter. The fact that certain well known individuals have made it their business to keep the campus boiling during the whole semester has led to no attempt to separate them from the college. That they have laid themselves wide open to such action can hardly be denied. In order to retain their professor of logic and ethics they have violated most blatantly most of the principles of logic and ethics by compiling unscientific statistics, by using unverified facts to exert pressure, and by publishing rumors as facts. Nevertheless, while they were thus showing that even their academic accomplishments in these fields were of questionable excellence, and while they were causing disturbances and pain, no action was instituted against them. Has it ever occurred to anyone that possibly a good many "stooges of the administration" whose academic work was somewhat disrupted by this unrest, realized that fundamentally these young men were motivated by affection and public-mindedness and that, whether they thought them right or wrong, they should not be penalized for their ardor. Do they realize that in other academic institutions they would have been hauled before a Dean's committee and been summarily dismissed for less than they have done here? Where then are the reasons for this fear which dictated an anonymous letter?

It is quite obvious that in any community certain laws governing the behavior of its citizens must be made and wisely enforced until those citizens become so wise that a "withering away" of the government can take place. Obviously again the decisions as to enforcement and, here, its supreme penalty - separation of the individual from the college - must be made by an individual or a group. The student body has had for a long time the Special Committee which is the obvious agency for this judicial action. The student body has insisted on frustrating this committee as much as possible, instead of building it into a democratic agency for its protection. Since this committee consists of a majority of students this could have been done without violation of logic or ethics. By neglecting this opportunity the student body has practically thrown the responsibility and power to effectuate the separation of students from the college into the lap of the administration and its "stooges" the faculty. In spite of this, no vengeance has been wreaked. The obvious alternatives then, for the student body, are either to recognize the right of the faculty and administration to practice what wisdom they possess in these matters, or to build up the prestige of their own Special Committee by giving it the opportunity to develop a wisdom of its own. Neither group will be infallible but either will be more effective, orderly and peace-inducing than an aroused mob.

The anonymity of the letter which is the cause of my writing this, is another attempt to exercise rights without taking responsibilities with it. It assumes that admittedly well meaning people would not have the acumen and courage to prevent miscarriages of justice caused by a possible misinterpretation of their statement of principles. In any possible re-writing of the paragraph I will adhere to the principle that it is logically wiser to term it broadly than to become so precise as to make it restrictive.

Sincerely,

Signed---Stefan Hirsch