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NOTE OF THE WEEK:

Craig Livingston (as he drove off in the Brac-mobile):
"Suffer, friends!—We win. We call it power."

COUNCIL TO INVESTIGATE STUDENT-SUPPORTED PROFESSORSHIP
ACTION POSTPONED ON NARCOTICS STATEMENT

Community Council Monday night moved to set up a committee to
look into the possibility of having a student-financed professorship
at Bard. The committee will consist of five students to be elected
by Council from names listed on a sign-up sheet to be posted in
Häseman. David Young, a member of the Community, brought the suggestion
before Council, saying that Paul Goodman had such a seat at San
Francisco State College.

The committee would investigate various aspects of the project,
such as financing, whether or not the professor would give courses for
credit, how often the professor would give courses, etc.

"There's a tremendous amount of potential in something like this," Mr. Young said.

A motion by Dean Hodkinson that Council go on record as supporting
the statement by the faculty endorsing the administration's position
on narcotics was postponed. In answer to a question by Councilman
Harvey Fleetwood, the Dean said that the problem was important enough
to have been acted upon by one of the "major constituencies" of the
college, and that it should be acted upon by another.

Chairman Craig Livingston asked if Council should take a position
against speeding, since two Bard students were killed in an automobile
accident eight years ago after they had been speeding.

The Dean replied that he was talking about drugs, not speeding,
and that the issue of traffic safety should be dealt with if and when it arose.

Councilman Anthony Marzani, chairman of the Educational Policies
Committee, announced that E.I.C. would be distributing a questionnaire
on the six-point program on each campus and on April 26. Students
who fail to fill out the questionnaire may obtain copies in the coffee
shop after that date. The questionnaires will be numbered so no one
can vote more than once.

Chairman Livingston commended E.I.C., saying that for the first
time since he had been at Bard that committee was doing something
constructive.

Paul Smith was elected keeper of the keys for the community
vehicle. He defeated Craig Livingston on a secret ballot, 3-2.

Two additions were made to the regulations concerning the vehicle
Organizations that use it will be charged a fee of $1 per mile, with
the proceeds to go into a fund to be used for repairs and maintenance.
A motion by Councilman Fleetwood passed to the effect that chairman
of organizations that are going to use the car should submit the names
of those people in the organizations who are going to use it to Mr.
Smith, the keeper of the keys. There were objections from some mem-
bers of the community that such a regulation would create unneces-
sary bureaucracy and paper work and would not ensure that a minimum
number of people drive the vehicle.

A motion by Councilman Marzani passed that sign-up sheets for
Orientation Committee and Elections Committee be posted this week
with election of the members of those committees to be held at the
next meeting of Council. An amendment to the motion by Councilman
Fleetwood also passed to the effect that Council post a calendar of
important dates coming up in the semester on the Council bulletin
board.

Councilman Marzani raised the issue of the motion passed by
Council at its last meeting last semester calling for clarification
of the Community Constitution. The Dean pointed out that the document
in question appears to be two constitutions, one for student government
and one for community government, and that to his knowledge neither had
ever been formally approved, either by the community or by Council.

Council Secretary Deborah Tarlow agreed to meet with the Dean to go over the minutes of past Councils to see if this were, in fact, the case. Discussion on the clarification motion was tabled until next week.

A motion by Councilman Andrew Krieger that a list of motions passed at each meeting of Council be compiled and posted and filed with the main body of Council minutes passed unanimously, with an amendment by Councilman William Lensing that twelve copies of the list of motions be made and distributed to each member of the Council and to the Dean's office. The list will include the name of the Councilman making the motion, the vote on it, and, if it is a roll call, the names of each member and how they voted. Krieger explained that this would facilitate investigation of the minutes for past actions of Council.

Elections will be held for the post of Assistant Treasurer, but a final decision will be made until next week. After the first ballot, a three-way tie existed between Linda Boul, Robert Edmonds, and John Goodman. A second ballot ended in a tie between Miss Boul and Mr. Edmonds. When a subsequent vote ended the same way, the final vote was postponed until next week.

A motion by Councilman Harvey Fleetwood to give five dollars to Dana Hausman and $1.50 to Craig Livingston for expenses incurred in going to Kingston to look at cars for the community vehicle failed by a vote of 4-3.

A request by Martin Tabnik for Council sanction for a Discount latent medicine concession was tabled for next week, after the Dean pointed out that if Mr. Tabnik purchased drugs from a mail-order firm and then resold them as a retail business, he could be "hauled into court the next day." The Dean also pointed out that Mr. Tabnik could possibly be held criminally liable for any ill effects suffered from the drugs.

Jeffrey D. Hortimer

ADMINISTRATION POSITION ON NARCOTICS

For All Students and Faculty
You are informed of the following action passed at the Faculty meeting of December 12, 1965:

The Faculty endorses the College's stated position on narcotics as contained in the President's and the Dean's Notice of September 6, 1965. As a Faculty we hold that the use of drugs has no allowable place in the life of study and development of the mind.

(Text of notice by The President and The Dean following:)

In view of the considerable attention being directed by newspapers and magazines to the narcotics problem throughout the country, the College wishes once again to affirm its own policy on this matter.

Possession, distribution or use of narcotics is a violation of the criminal law, and of the regulations of the College. Evidence of such involvement constitutes grounds for immediate dismissal from College, and a permanent entry upon the student's academic record.

This statement is made at this time in order that the position of the College may be absolutely clear; and in order that no student may unknowingly imperil his or her academic career.

(signed) Norman Kline, President
(signed) Harold L. Hodgkinson, Dean

EDITORS

CONGRATULATIONS FOR COUNCIL

Congratulations are in order to Community Council for its holiday night meeting. Discussion was orderly, the Councilmen kept their heads, and business was dispensed with efficiently and expeditiously. No one knew to buy sweatshirts, no one fell off his chair laughing, and the Chairman didn't leave the chair once.

Whether all this came about because several Council members were absent and there was only a small gathering in the audience, or because everyone was tired after vacation, or because most of the Council members had a lot of work to do and wanted to get home early, I don't know. I would like to think it's because Council members and the Chairman have finally been to take their jobs seriously and are trying earnestly to work for the Community. I do know one thing—more constructive action was accomplished in this relatively brief hour-and-forty-five-minute meeting than in any one of the
previous three-and-four-hour marathons to which we have been subjected.

If the boys have finally settled down, I'd like to make two suggestions, one of which was followed to a certain extent Monday night. The first, the one that was followed somewhat, is that Good and Welfare should be a much more important part of Council meetings. This is theoretically the part of the meeting when anyone in the Community can come forth and make suggestions for the "good and welfare" of Bard College. David Young made good use of this time Monday night, but all too often Good and Welfare comes at the end of a long, long night when everyone wants nothing better than to get home as soon as possible, and the willingness to listen to even the most worthwhile proposal is practically nonexistent. It's painful to think of the good ideas that have gone down the drain because some poor soul has been laughed out of Alboe social during Good and Welfare.

The second is that all motions, other than procedural ones such as motions to adjourn, table, move on to the orders of the day, etc., be submitted to the Chairman several days in advance of the meeting. This way a more complete agenda could be posted in Heegeman than is now the case, students would know precisely what was coming up and could be on hand to voice their opinions on issues they felt strongly about, and Council members would have time to organize their thoughts on those issues before they are called upon to discuss them.

I hope Council will consider these proposals; and I'd like to commend them again for the orderly, sane, and fruitful meeting of Monday night. It was truly admirable.

Jeffrey Mortimer

BRAC AND BRIME

A sacred cow now commands the moral affirmation of Bard students; its name is BRAC. Its rights and prerogatives in the cause of "radical social change" have become as unassailable as the self-righteous piety of "old-time" religionists. One must either consent to BRAC's program of "Civil Rights in 1966" or bear the stigma of moral irresponsibility. This new evangelism sees things that clearly. The BRAC request for a vehicle to haul their compatriots back and forth to Kingston and to assist them in their proselytizing duties is the object in question.

Those who attended the April 4th meeting of Council witnessed in Chairman Livingston's new and arrogant display of homelidtic flourishes. The Dean's question to Mr. Livingston regarding alternate means of transportation for BRAC was met with a condescending reprimand. Stepping down from his chair, Mr. Livingston announced to Council that "the Dean and I are going to have a disagreement." With the histrionic effusiveness of Robespierre, he set up the categories of moral action: You question the prerogative of BRAC, and you bear the burden of conscience.

Hence when Councilman Krieger questioned the Chairman's flaunted self-righteousness, Mr. Livingston replied that "obviously no one is going to be against Civil Rights in 66. This is a matter of conscience."

There are people on this campus who do object to BRAC's notion of Civil Rights in 1966. There are people on this campus who would question the proposition that the attainment of civil rights demands "radical social change." But these people remain outside the purview of BRAC's liberality.

Let us not delude ourselves - a vehicle that is paid for with $50.00 from the Cow unity treasury and $50.00 from the BRAC budget is not a "Community vehicle." The awareness of the need for community transportation never took on significant proportions until Chairman Livingston sensed unanimous opposition to BRAC's request. Transportation needs do exist for the Red Balloon, the Entertainment Committee, and the Bard Observer. But it will soon obtain to their disadvantage to have agreed to a community financed vehicle. A collective arrangement with existing administration facilities would have been a more efficient and economical solution to their needs.

But the fact stands. The Bard Social Action Committee has penetrated upon this student body the house that this vehicle is community property. In fact, such is the probable community deficit accruing from this purchase can be financed only by appropriating monies from other Cow unity organizations who do not even have use of the vehicle.

But remember! Mr. Livingston would have an appropriate answer to anyone's objection to this possibility: "No one is going to be
against Civil Rights in 1966." One is forced to ask whether the acidy brine of BRAC's past activism has not become in this semester the stale self-righteous bilge-water of evangelizing Yahoos. John A. Taylor

PROGRESS IS OUR MOST IMPORTANT SUBJECT?

At first glance, the replacement of a large number of the bound volumes in the Bard Library periodical collection with microfilm seems like a definite step forward. However, before this trend continues, I should like to express a few reservations. There are many disadvantages to microfilm as compared with bound volumes.

Microfilm cannot be used anywhere except in the library where it is open. Further, the number of machines in the library, at this time five, limits the number of people who can access to the entire microfilm collection at any one time. Also, many people find it far more difficult to read microfilm than the printed page.

Microfilm is not as easy to use as are bound volumes. Bound volumes can be taken off the shelf and immediately opened to the proper page. Microfilm has to be removed from the box, threaded into the machine, and then cranked until the proper page is reached. This greatly increases the time required to look up each reference, and makes browsing difficult if not impossible.

Machines on the Bard Campus are always prone to being vandalized, and broken. There is no reason to believe that the library's microfilm machines will be any exception. This will further reduce the availability of the periodicals.

The library is to be judged for filling in the gaps in our periodical collection. This is something that needed doing for a long time. But was it necessary to do away with the bound journals that we have and replace them with impractical microfilm?

Matt Lefkstein

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR:

April 18, 1966

To the Editor of the Gaffly:

Many students enjoy yellow journalism, though few would be inclined to subscribe to the "National Enquirer." Many students thrive upon exposes which degrade any kind of established organization, though a sizable majority would refrain from such derogation in their personal expression until they had studied the facts and conditions of the matter. Such attitudes are considered, by those on the staff of your publication as well as numerous others, to be healthy.

I take exception. Though I admire the Gaffly's forthright expression, and occasionally discover an article of interest, I wholeheartedly condemn irresponsible journalism. Allowing for the inexperience of your writers, an article of satire must either be recognizable as such, or it must be factual. Discussions of both institutions and personalities should not be superficial, but should exemplify careful study and considered evaluation. If the Gaffly, supposedly a reflection of student interests and ideas, is to be written almost entirely by one or two individuals—was the case last week—then it must be conscious of intelligent values in journalism.

The Gaffly has possibilities, though its editorial talents might well have been better invested in the improvement of the Bard Observer. I have heard nothing about the Observer being involved in news mismanagement, or editorial discrimination. But perhaps that's next week's target, eh boys? In any case, I wish to see some responsibility in the disposition of Gaffly affairs. If a repudiation of the efforts of B & G is to be published, let it be an expression of the community feeling, rather than of Jeffrey Hortimer, and let it be presented against a background of fact, rather than discreditable and indistinct generalization.

Robert C. Edmonds
Dear Godfily,

Could it possibly be that in your frenzied search for new and different institutions to satirize, you have gone a bit overboard? After all, a little fairness is to be expected. Who keeps the campus functioning in at least a semblance of physical order if not B&G? Who paved the Newbury path? Who keeps the dorms (mind you, not the rooms) clean? One tends to become bog ed down in specifics and ignore the overall picture. It took me ten minutes last week to get B&G up to fix a light socket. Anyway, with all the cons, here is a small pro.

Susan Lee

To the Godfily:

Though I too have encountered some difficulties in dealing with B&G, I resent the tone of the contest proposed by Mr. Hortimer. "The First Annual Glorious B&G Competition" has the potential of becoming not only caustic and witty but more important, it could be further damaging to the relationship between B&G personnel and the student body. To ridicule B&G activities will no doubt bring in tones of intellectual superiority by student contributors. This can only lead to humiliation and needless harassment of individuals working for B&G. If Mr. Hortimer is interested in more than ridicule, perhaps he could compile a listing of major complaints each week for publication in the Godfily. This would constructively point the way for action by B&G and not merely poke fun at B&G operations. Again, in the finest tradition of the Godfily, there is a multitude of witty critics none of which are in the least constructive and none of which lift the Godfily writers from the level of these people they criticize.

Martin Bernstein

A REPLY

I would like to make several points in answer to Mr. Bernstein and Mr. Edmonds, since their letters are directed to my article in last week's Godfily. First of all, I appreciate the reasonable, constructive tone of Mr. Bernstein's letter. The ultimate hope of the article was that somehow ways and means of improving B&G's service would be brought forth. I must apologize for the statement that B&G renders no services to the community. The last sentence in the article was conceived and written in haste. I had misgivings about it at the time, but the pressure of a deadline was upon me, an unfortunate reality of the "mag, biz." I hoped to get people writing to the Godfily, whether pro or con B&G. I am glad to see that this purpose, at least, was served. And any letters that contained a tone of intellectual superiority, expressed or implied, would have a difficult time getting printed. We do exercise some editorial responsibility.

Mr. Edmonds' letter befuddles me. The purpose of the Godfily is not to "degrade any kind of established organization." We published a laudatory article about the bookstore, and have even gone so far as to commend Council in this issue. I might point out to Mr. Edmonds that the Godfily's writers are at least as experienced as most other people who write for campus publications, and perhaps more so; and I also don't know what he means when he says satire should be either recognizable or factual. Recognizable by whom? And what is factual satire?

Further, we don't like the idea of one or two individuals writing the Godfily each week any more than Mr. Edmonds does, mainly because we have to do it. If this bothers him so much, we suggest he make a few more contributions. The purpose of the Godfily could not have been served by incorporation with the Observer. One is an organ of opinion and the other, theoretically, an organ of news (and there has been known to be "news mismanagement" too).

Finally, there is no way to get "an expression of community feeling" other than letting individuals express themselves through the medium of the Godfily. Unless you simply want us to print results of polls.

Jeffrey T. Hortimer
LAST BOOK MICROFILMED: MODERNIZATION OF THE BARD LIBRARY COMPLETE. from the C又是ly April 21, 1986

The modernization of the Bard library was completed today when, in a public ceremony, the microfilm edition of the complete Oxford English Dictionary was placed in its cabinet. The ceremony, marking the end of a twenty-year project, was attended by the President, the Dean, members of the student body and several representatives of M.Y.O.F.I.A. (Microfilm for Youth and Other People In America).

From a modest beginning in 1966, when the Bard periodical collection was first placed on microfilm, the program expanded to include several rare manuscripts in the library's holdings, including the complete Presidential papers of George Murphy with words, music, and choreography. Another milestone was reached when all twelve volumes of Tennyson's A Study of History were reduced to a single microdot in 1970. Three years later, in a progressive move, the art library's record collection followed.

Further progress was made in 1978 when the Admissions Office began sending microfilmed catalogues to all prospective students. Following suit, the Bard College Bookstore became the Bard College Microfilm Store beginning in the spring term of 1983.

The book-burning which highlighted the ceremony was curried only by picketing by S.O.B., the Save Our Books society.

Matt Perlstein
Jeffrey Mortimer
Ilene Rosen

UPLCREASE OBSOLETE 1985

One of the things that make watching Council so frustrating is the great potential which is squandered each week on unconscious trivia or conscious attempts at enacting the community. It became evident early in the semester that the Fresh (or perhaps the word is naive) insights brought to the meetings by Council framing were bringing new pressure to bear on the flimsy structure of "unwritten tradition". All Mr. Lensing expected from the Council was a little consistency and logic when Council made its decisions. His reactions to the illogical and inconsistency which greeted him every Monday night, attracted attention to a situation which has long lain unacknowledged, in the darker recesses of Council's past. Council, in all the years that it has been sitting, has managed to accumulate a virtual ritual of unwritten and half-remembered precedent. In the last two years the creeping of obsolete machinery and the scratching of a non-workable Constitution, overloaded with invisible clauses, could be heard by all but the most unobservant.

The 1986 Council has decided to halt its breathless spending spree long enough to pause and examine itself. Last Monday night, the Council members discussed and passed motions which will begin the groundwork towards a clarification or itself, its powers and its goals. Councilman Bernstein's pet project, a re-examination of old minutes to discover some of these ancient precedents, was revived and may now see some action. The motion made by Mr. Krieger, to have a separate listing of all motions made by Council, deserves mention. We may finally see Constitutional revision as well.

Council indeed deserves to be complimented. Never, in the memory of this reporter, has a more earnest and conscientious attempt been made at removing the debris that has collected around that body.

Ilene Rosen