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"If we cannot originate a program, we are all sound judges of liars."

Pericles, Funeral Oration

COUNCIL REJECTS A. M. VAL TO ADMINISTRATION AND FACULTY NARCOTICS STATEMENT

By a roll-call vote of 14-6, Community Council Monday night refused to endorse the administration statement on the use of narcotics, as approved by the faculty.

The discussion on the motion took up the major part of the meeting, with open debate limited to thirty minutes and each Council member given one minute at the end of the debate to summarize his position. The following are the summaries of the positions advanced by each of the Council members:

Councilman Bernstein said he sympathized with the position of the administration and agreed with the statements of Matthew Perlstein, a member of the Community who was present, that Council was arguing about technicalities in order to avoid facing the real issue, which was to take a firm stand against the use of narcotics. "We shouldn't disagree with those who know better than we do about these things," he said, adding that he meant state legislators and professionals in the field.

Councilman Fleetwood wanted to know how the faculty and administration defined narcotics. He pointed out that the Director of health services at Princeton University did not consider marijuana, hallucinogens and stimulants as narcotics. He also said that the faculty statement disagreed with the statement by the American Association of University Professors that educational institutions should not duplicate the functions of law-enforcement agencies.

He added that marijuana was less harmful than alcohol in its effects, and that the punishment meted out for its use, in this case possible expulsion from school, far outweighed the severity of the offense.

Councilman Friedman pointed out that the statement that the use of drugs has no allowable place in the development of the mind is "an exceedingly broad one, that has not been verified empirically." "I do not believe in athletics as therapy," he said. "There is no evidence that the effects of drugs are always the same on their users. Cases should be handled on a more individual basis."

Dean Hodgkinson indicated that the administration considered as a narcotic anything that was defined as such by the law of the state of New York, "We are not discussing the merits of individual drugs, but the use of narcotics," he said. "Experts do differ of course."

He said the school shouldn't permit freshman to enter and perhaps be reduced to vegetables from using drugs that were forced on them by other students. He added that if anyone knew of a way to keep pushers off the campus without banning the use of drugs entirely, he would be glad to hear it. "I have yet to hear any constructive alternatives offered to the administration's position," he said.

Councilman Krieger said that two things were at issue: the faculty position, which was a moral one, and the administration's which was legalistic. He said that Council was being asked to approve the moral judgment of the faculty, and he didn't feel that Council had a right to take moral positions and enforce them on the rest of the Community.

Councilman Lanning said, in part, "I'm sure some of the faculty have friends who use drugs. They can read. They know what's going on. The faculty is certainly cognizant of some things, and we made a judgment about them. We know well we may be wrong. We don't have the word straight from God. We may know some things we don't. There are laws, even though the legislators may be wrong. I don't see how, from any sensible point of view, you can say you won't uphold the laws of the state of New York."
Councilman Marsani objected to the notion on the grounds that it was a blanket condemnation and too all-encompassing. He felt Council shouldn't try to prohibit actions by consenting adults.

Councilman McCune sympathized with the position of the administration and agreed with it.

Councilman Hellett read an article from the New York Times concerning seven students attending NYU who were caught using marijuana. They were not expelled or suspended, but rather asked to leave the dormitory where they resided and allowed to re-apply for admission to school.

"We should not be swayed by the hysteria of the press. We should not take a stand against drugs. We should not become part of this hysteria," he said, adding that the statement by the faculty "smells of in loco parentis and extends to when we are not here. I do not condone or condemn the use of narcotics or drugs for anyone but myself."

Councilman Shute said "we are trying to attack a symptom, and jumping on the same bandwagon that's going after Leary now. I would like to emphasize that I know all too many people who are taking this stuff not for what it might be, but because it's for kicks," but he felt that society was at fault for this and Council would be going after symptoms rather than causes.

Shute later added that, "I am not going to throw unfortunate people in jail because they choose to have certain experiences, nor do I recommend emulating those who have those experiences. I see us, as intellectuals, following instead of leading. I understand the position of the administration. They don't want to see the school shut down, but it's unnecessary for Council to approve this, because if someone gets caught, they're going to get hurt."

The vote on the notion to approve the faculty and administration position was as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Marzani</th>
<th>Yeas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Flewwod</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hellett</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Krieger</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Frieder</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Shute</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chairman Craig Livingston announced that ten campus organizations had submitted their constitutions, and ruled that no organization would be able to get money from now on until it had submitted a constitution.

A motion by Councilman Bernstein passed to appoint a committee to look into minutes of Council since 1961 and extract procedural, organizational and procedural motions or amendments. The committee would make up an index of those so they can be adopted now at the beginning of each semester. A sign-up sheet will be posted in Hegeman for the committee.

Council approved a motion to ask the administration to have an exhaust fan installed in Satterly Hall to alleviate the problem of smoke. In return, Council will publicize requests to individuals not to leave broken bottles or empty six-packs in Satterly.

A motion by Councilman Flewwod passed to allot $1,99 to Dana Hausman and $14.50 to Craig Livingston for expenses incurred in going to Kingston to investigate the purchase of a community vehicle.

The Dean reported that an investigation he had conducted with Council secretary Devorah Tarrow revealed that the community government constitution was approved by a referendum in 1961, and that the student government constitution was rejected. "And," chairman Livingston ruled that the community government was operating under the community government constitution.

In the run-off election for the post of Assistant Treasurer, Linda Doult was elected over Robert Reonds.

The following people were elected to the committee to investigate the possibilities for a student-financed visiting professor: David Young, Andrew Krieger, Sandy Hubert, Daniel Frieder, and Hank Davis.

The following members were appointed to the Elections Committee: Councilmen Krieger and Marsani, and members of the community justine Sabiti and Devorah Tarrow.

Elected to the Orientation Committee were: Robert Judd, Linda Potter, James Pine, Peter Irwin, Sharon Bercan, Jeffrey Martimer, Frank...
Hutzer, Mark Favage, Mark Karins, Jeffrey Alberts, Judi Arner, Ilene Rosen, John Goodman, Tony Marzani, Robert Edmonds, Paul Schneider, Tom Noonan, Toni Chapman, Justin Sabiti, Peter Munichiello, Jeffrey Levy, Martha Schwartz, and Lynn Meyerson.

James Fine, speaking for the Red Balloon, announced that the sandwich man was no longer dealing with that establishment.

"BRAC AND BRINE"

and now shades of "Tailgunner" Joe ? ? ?

The Bard Community owes a vote of thanks to Guy Farrell for stating clearly and definitively in this week's Observer the goals of the Bard Racial Action Committee in neighboring Kingston. His letter, I hope, will be read by every community member concerned with the question of a BRAC vehicle. My "BRAC and Brine" editorial has succeeded then in eliciting a const active response around which people, individually, may decide upon the justifiability of BRAC's request. I thank Mr. Farrell for it.

Mr. Livingston's letter to the editor, which appeared immediately below Mr. Farrell's, is an embarrassment both to BRAC and to himself. Either Mr. Livingston intentionally conceals his mistake behind the organizational philosophy of BRAC, or he does not comprehend the intention of my editorial.

Whether he will admit to it or not, my criticism in "BRAC and Brine" was directed to exposing his moral pomposity -- a self-righteous egotism so callous and intractable that I was compelled to document it by quotation. My attack is no more irresponsible than the black and white reality of his words.

But by far, the greater embarrassment to him is the method by which he addresses me. "Answer to a Conservative" is the preface to his letter. "John Faylor who is co-chairman of the Bernard Iddings Bell Conservative Society ... like so many of his kind seems trapped in an ivory tower of conservative platitudes, always willing to criticize those in the streets but unwilling to act himself". The fact stands open to anyone who re-read my criticism; "BRAC and Brine" is unpollitical in every categorical sense. My criticisms are directed not against BRAC's goals and principles but against the manner in which Mr. Livingston enunciated them as the spokesman for that organization. "Radical social change" is Mr. Livingston's phrase, not mine; if he will deny that there are people on this campus who disagree with this proposition for the attainment of civil rights, then the limits of his liberality are even narrower than I thought.

But why would Mr. Livingston label me, then argue from an unqualified premise? Cle' Joe McCarthy used to do something like it, as I am sure he would remind me. Mr. Livingston obviously does not want to confront the thrust of my criticism, which is, to repeat, an attack which could be no more blatantly directed at him.
No, Mr. Livingston and I do not see "eye to eye" on many things, but the existence of my political predilection should have no bearing on this matter of community importance. I spoke as a member of the Bard Community with a genuine grievance — I was in turn attacked, not in terms of this grievance, but rather as a person "trapped in an ivory tower of conservative platitudes." The inquisition is only a step away.

Certainly, there is nothing "ivory tower" about the civil right which affirms a person's right to dissent; or maybe Mr. Livingston would choose to take issue? Again, "maybe the acidy brine of BRAC's past activism has become in this semester, in this spokesman for BRAC, the stale self-righteous bilgewater of evangelizing Yahoons."

John A. Faylor

**NARCOTICS: THE ISSUE**

Narcotics are a problem at Bard. As a result of them, Bard students have been jailed, placed under psychiatric care, and, in a losing instance, confined to a mental hospital as a human vegetable. All of the students, were it not for narcotics, would be continuing their education at this institution.

Last Monday night Community Council was given the opportunity to face the issue of whether or not we should condemn the use of narcotics here. If the illegality of narcotics in New York state were not enough reason for restriction, the cases cited above should have been sufficient stimulus. It is understandable that there were objections to the wording of the faculty statement which they were asked to endorse; but it is to their disadvantage that they avoided taking a firm stand by refusing to formulate an alternative statement.

Some members of Council are afraid to face the issue. Apparently they fear that Council will offend if it presumes to make judgments on issues which touch personal morality. But what governing body worth its name can avoid such action? If Council continues to negate its reasons for existence, i.e., responsible action, the Bard Community will find itself in a position where only the authority of the Administration will be valid. Can we allow this possibility to become actuality? We appeal to Council to cease side-stepping and confront the reality of its position in the Bard Community.

Lorraine Smith
Matt Perlestein

**LETTERS TO THE EDITORS**

For the Gadfly

Too bad that traditional practice is gone with the wind. Is it really so hard to smile, to listen attentively, to talk to someone, not at them? I attended another community council meeting last night, and it was sad to see the manner in which the Dean and Mr. Lensing were "handled." Several times both men were addressed in an off-hand, inconsiderate fashion, verging on being outright rude. Come on boys (manhood is a long way off), let's not show our true colors. Politeness (I believe the word is still in use) can be more than a superficial act. I've witnessed occasions when it was as down-to-earth as "integration, freedom, equality, and (on bended knee) the Kingston Tutorial Project." Think about it, who knows, maybe we've found the way out of a tragic dilemma.

Guy E. Frank

To the Editors of Gadfly Newspaper,

It is difficult to understand the purpose behind the article entitled "Last Book MicroFilmed: Modernization of the Bard Library Complete" in the April 21 issue of Gadfly Newspaper. It seems to be an attempt
to oppose the use of microfilm in the Bard College Library. In accomplishing this, however, the authors manage to degrade the use of microfilm in general. I see no need to explain the importance of microfilm as a tool in the organization and storage of the vast amount of information which man has acquired. Perhaps Mr. Perlstein, Mr. Horstimer, and Miss Baubé do not fully reject the possibilities of the use of this means of data storage. If so, they should have clarified the purpose behind their "amusing" anecdote, which, by censoring every aspect of microfilming conjured up by the authors, provides no valuable criticism at all.

Kitty Rauscher

To the Gaddfly,

It seems that the article "BRAC and Brine" is more a personal attack on Craig Livingston's ideas than an accurate appraisal of the problem, if there is one, of a non-communal community vehicle. On the basis of Craig's presentation and interpretation of a question related to his personal commitment, Mr. Faylor has made several assumptions concerning BRAC and then stated them as facts. He says:

1) that BRAC's libidality does not include people who question the attainment of civil rights through "radical social change".

2) that BRAC's larger contribution toward the purchase of the car means that we do not have a community vehicle.

3) that BRAC is going to take advantage of the other groups because of this method of purchase.

4) that BRAC has perpetrated a hoax on the community.

I have omitted "facts", except for the first one, has had the chance for empirical backing. Mr. Faylor has no evidence to support his statements because the car has not yet been in use. How can he presume to judge misuse without first having seen the way the vehicle is used? I should think it would take at least a semester of activity to determine whether or not our community vehicle was being appropriated by any one group.

Since the first "fact" is the only one which, at this time, can be examined objectively, Mr. Faylor would benefit by taking an opinion poll of BRAC members and others associated closely with the organization. I hypothesize that he will find people within the group who question the attainment of civil rights through "radical social change".

It is unfair of the author to assume that the personal viewpoint of any one member of a group represents the opinion of the group as a whole.

Let's have more objectivity.

Johanna Bauby
Michael Sheaffer

REPLY TO MR. SILVER AND MISS BAUBÉ

Miss Bauby, Mr. Sheaffer, and Mr. Livingston, as well as other members of the community, I'm afraid, seem to have entirely missed the point of John Faylor's article "BRAC and Brine". Their horrified reaction, however, is typical of the very attitude which John was criticizing. He was criticizing the idea that attacking BRAC's tactics means an attack on civil rights, something that just is not done. It seems to me a very cynical attitude, an attitude hardly worthy of the ideals of the Movement, to believe that one can get away with anything one wants, in the name of "social justice", because no one dares to appear to criticize the Civil Rights Movement in 1966. Does Craig Livingston mean for us to accept that a good end justifies any sort of shady means? I can hardly agree.

Linda Potter

THE USEFULNESS OF BOUND PERIODICALS

Several questions have arisen as to why we anti-progressives on the Gaddfly are opposed to the replacement of Bard's bound periodical collection with microfilm. The first point we should bear in mind is that bound periodicals must be of some value, since Academic Archives was extremely interested in getting them. It is unlikely that that organization would enter into an agreement that it felt was disadvantageous to itself.

The second point is that periodicals are far more useful in certain disciplines in the form of bound volumes than on microfilm, particularly in the field of the social sciences. Students interested in
investigating the worth of particular books for their purposes often use
the bound periodicals to look up reviews of books.

There are also a large number of useful articles that have been
reprinted in anthologies and have to be read in the original journals in
which they were published.

Many fields of interest, especially for major conferences and
senior projects, are areas that have not been adequately covered in books.
Students find themselves doing all their reading in journals, in an attempt
to piece together relevant information that cannot be otherwise obtained.

Finally, some professors give courses whose reading assignments
are partly or wholly in the journals. It is not difficult to imagine the
problems that would arise when a class of twenty or thirty has one week
to use five microfilm machines, and the cost of having each student make
a copy of the reading for himself would be prohibitive.

We hope that the position of the gadfly on this issue will not
continue to be interpreted as one of negativistic obstructionism. While
realizing the benefits of microfilm, we also realize that there are draw-
backs to its use, and that more careful consideration of those drawbacks
should have been given before the periodical collection was consigned to
the spools.

Matt Perlstein
John Taylor
Jeffrey Mortimer

WHERE OH WHERE HAS THE STAMP MACHINE GONE???

I would like to call attention to the sad history of the mail
room stamp machine. Installed at the beginning of the semester, it was
inoperable within a week because of a stolen handle. Student vandalism
was thus directly responsible for the removal of a student convenience.

Discussion of such perverso behavioral patterns unfortunately
has little effect on the perverso children exhibiting them. All one can
do is smile ironically in this instance as some Eard students continue
to defect their own interests by performing juvenile pranks in the name
of the Great God COOL.

Loraine Smith