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QUOTE OF THE WEEK

"The right to disagree publicly is one of the privileges of a free society. . . . But when you take to the soapbox of minority opinion, remember that any new idea is easy to talk about but hard to sell. The decibels of your voice and the theatrics of your behavior are poor substitutes for the logic of your persuasion and the soundness of your arguments."

THE RIGHT TO DISSENT: Newsweek

6 COUNCILMEN CHOSEN

The results of the election for six council seats are as follows:
Dan Brady.................. 180
Dick Ransohoff.............. 180
Robert C. Edmonds......... 178
Linda Boldt................. 150
Steven Tremper.............. 144
Alison Raphael............. 131

The three losing candidates are:
Robert May.................. 133
Lonne Yongue.............. 116
Harvey Fleetwood.......... 99

Four of the six winning candidates appeared at Sottery Hall Monday night to present their platforms. The following is a summary of those statements.

Mr. Robert Edmonds said that Council should expand its field of interests. He thought that Council might try to find a solution to the "food problem". One suggestion that he offered was for an improved ventilation system in dining commons.

He thought Council might look into the "telephone situation" as it stands on campus. "At the moment", he said, "there are about 60 people per telephone"; and he thought that this was an unbearable situation.

Edmonds believed that Council might do something about the poor condition of the roads around campus, and ensure that their repair would be more than a superficial job.

He would also like to see a student representative on the Long-Range Planning Committee, acting in an advisory capacity.

Mr. Edmonds summed up his position by saying that, "Council was not an organ of student concern because it does not yet have the capacity for leadership." He said that "Council could not become functional until it becomes representative of the opinion of the community, Council could increase its responsibility by increasing its capacity to express student opinion."

Miss Linda Boldt said that she supported existing Council programs. She would like to change the 6-Point Program.

She would like to change the Social Regulations. She would like to see the implementation of a Due Process Board.

She would like to see a workable management for the Red Balloon to put it on a profit-making basis for its managers.

Miss Boldt said, that if elected, she would call for a report on the proposal to increase the size of the student body and the proportional numbers of faculty members.

Mr. Steven Tremper thought that Council should be involved in more areas than the allocation of funds.

He thought that the referendum be used by Council before making major policy decisions.

Mr. Tremper said that the movies on Friday nights were an important function and he made several suggestions for improved viewing.

He thought that more current films might be shown. He suggested the purchase of a larger screen to make room for subtitles. He suggested that a second projector be purchased to avoid the long pauses when the projectionist is changing reels; and he suggested the installation of a fan to dissipate the smoke from Sottery Hall.

Mr. Tremper thought that a transportation arrangement similar to the one for Schuyler House, be set up for the residents of Blithewood, Robbins House and Ward Manor.

He suggested an investigation into the possibility of turning the Bard bookstore into a cooperative.

He suggested a commission to investigate the Slater system. Mr. Tremper said that "we should be getting better meals for the money we pay for board."

And, he suggested the formation of a security system to prevent theft from the library.

Miss Alison Raphael said that her platform was similar to that of SDS.
It may, perhaps, be systematic of a reverse McCarthyism on this campus that I feel obligated to begin this article with a disclaimer, but I want to be clearly understood: I am not now, nor have I ever been, a member of the Republican party. I am not a Birch'er, a Goldwaterite, a Phyllorite, nor do I belong to the Young Americans for Freedom. Most people would consider me as in the far left wing of the Democratic party, which probably places me somewhere to the right-of-center in the Bard political spectrum. I know, for example, that one of my fellow Bordians referred to my candidacy for Community Council as an example of 'right reaction' on campus. So much for the disclaimer.

Now that we know where I stand, I would like to make a few comments on the manifesto issued last week by the Bard chapter of the Students for a Democratic Society. The word "manifesto" may soon rather harsh to some, but it's the only word I can find adequate to describe this document.

I find it rather puzzling that an organization which includes the word "democratic" in it title should have distributed such a statement in the first place. Democracy implies the expression of the will of the majority, butody our knowledge, the majority of the Bard campus was not consulted about the pronouncements included. Further, no provisions are described for determining what the feelings of the community might be about these proposals. We are simply told that they "ought" to be, "should" to be, and, in one case, "must" be carried out. The only democracy this resembles is the guided variety of the M. H. Sukarno.

It also seems evident that SDS has only a hazy notion of democracy itself. Democracy is primarily a political phenomenon, an institutionalized means of manipulating the power of society, as well as an influence on educational patterns. But an individual college, or even education itself, is not a polity. The primary purpose of the organization is not a political one. Democracy may be a valuable means of achieving desirable ends in a political framework, but it is not a golden panacea for solving all the problems of any and all kinds of institutions. Many institutions, in fact, are non-democratic, and could not perform their functions properly if they were. A college is such an institution. Its function is to educate, and democracy is not always (and perhaps not even often) the most efficacious means for performing that function. Education implies the transmission of knowledge from one group of individuals to another. Presumably, the group that possesses the knowledge is in a better position to determine what should be transmitted, and how, than the group that does not possess it. To put it another way, the ideal situation in a political democracy is one in which all the participants are equally capable of judging the issues and arriving at some sort of rational decision; but at a college the students are not usually qualified to make crucial decisions concerning educational policy, or they would not be students in the first place.

As far as the specific suggestions themselves are concerned, our brilliant and during manifesto becomes a rather sordid affair when closely viewed. Most of the proposals are either already being acted upon, or are a trifle unrealistic, or even vague to merit serious consideration unless more adequately developed.

Numbers 5, 6, and 9 fall into the first category. A committee has been appointed to investigate ways and means of bringing a student-sponsored professor to Bard, BCG has been busy on the issue of the 6 Point Program all semester, and the Due Process report is up for an airing by Council within the very near future (although how the Due Process will ensure the integrity of the community is beyond me).

Numbers 3, 5, and 7 must have been written without an awareness of the necessity of preserving society. As a news of the situations as they exist in the form of organizing society, it also lacks (lack of acquaintance with the facts)
SDS manifesto (cont')

Curfew, for all its absurdity, inequity and stupidity, is something I'm afraid we're going to have to live with until there is a radical change in the mores of the American public. In the first place, the Board of Trustees is unlikely to agree to its abolition; in the second place, mothers who are worried enough about their darling daughters going off to college are unlikely to send them to a school with no curfew and unlimited intervisitation, whether or not their imaginations are justified. As for numbers 6 and 7, even if it were possible for the entire community to be informed beforehand of such expenditures (and I understand that it might not be), I am unsure as to what benefit would accrue from our being so informed. Would we all gather on the tombs courts to voice our yea's and nays? That instance where the administration might just possibly be better able to judge than we are, although this would be no excuse for deliberate accuracy.

Rubbers and pins are the vague ones. What exactly is meant by a "specific act"? By what machinery would the results of the referendum be binding upon the community? We are also once again confronted with the notion that there is something innately virtuous about the show of weight of numbers, if 25% of the community (only about 50 individuals) request a referendum on whether or not the rule against going barefoot in dining commons should be enforced, why then shall there be a referendum. On the other hand, a worthwhile but unprofitable proposal might not be exciting enough to sign a petition about and we would have to go through the dull, old machinery of representative democracy to get action on it.

There has not, to my knowledge (although admittedly I am not omniscient), been any great climber for courses to be offered to the upper college students on a pass-fail basis. It seems that the goal to be achieved by this is to "give the community an opportunity for experimenting with a new type of grading system." In other words, experimentation, in and of itself and with no particular end in mind, is a wonderful, desirable end. Experimentation is necessary to preserve the vitality of the educational system anywhere, but experimentation for no particular reason is, at best, silly and irrelevant.

What are we left with, then, from all this glorious manifesto? "All student markings of non-objective papers and examinations must be abolished" (a point with which no right-thinking Bardin, including myself, would disagree), and "The national minimum wage should be paid to all students and non-students who are employed by the Board of Trustees" (the question arises as to how many who are covered by minimum wage law are not being paid the minimum wage--if some there are, action is obviously necessary; but this is in the province of the courts and could hardly be remedied by action on the part of a student or faculty body such as Council or the Faculty Senate).

It is probably too much to hope that this essay will materially affect the political views of most Bardins, one way or another. It will probably not be as widely read or nodded-in-agreement-over as the SDS statement, and it will be published too late to be used as a coercive force against the candidates for Council. But I hope that the SDS-ers and their followers will somehow come to realize that it is possible for a liberal to question their methods and objectives, that there are those who are neither for them or against them, and that a person who feels he does not possess a social conscience can rationally disagree with them without necessarily approving of the Ku Klux Klan or the American Nazi Party.

Jeffrey T. Mortimer

SAND CASTLES AT MCCOYVILLE

This is the kind of editorial which usually appears before the election, but publishing considerations what they are, and after reading the statements of six of the possible nine candidates, I decided that it really didn't matter after all.

I sat through about two hours of speechifying in Soberly Hall Monday night and came away with the profound impression that events which took place this semester just hadn't sunk in to the candidates. They all had this grandiose vision of Council briefly coming to the fore and taking a hand in the planning of the future of Bard, both academic and otherwise. They, of course, were trying to convince us that they were the people we wanted to help shape our brave new world.

I was amazed at the wonder where these hopefuls were over the long weeks between the beginning of the semester and last Monday night. They had not obviously sat in on many Council meetings, because if they had they would have seen an organism incapable of assuming the tasks proposed. I had written several weeks ago that Council could not be involved itself in administrative activities until it
"Sand Castles" (Cont.)

had cleared its own house; by this I meant a searching examination into its past record to discover what it is and what it is not legally capable of attempting. I remember predicting, oh Idealist that I was, that we might even see constitutional reform before this session was done. This, of course, proved to be a mirage.

Now we have nine possible candidates, six of whom feel it important enough to appear before what members of the community chose to show up, and explain their positions. In the wake of proposals, never once was there a hint of the possibility that these proposals might be either illegal or impossible to enact given the existing structures. Not one of the candidates suggested that we examine Council precedent. Instead they chose to pile upon an at best, uncertain foundation, a broader and broader range of Council activity, until it resembles a pile of self-destructive sculpture that will someday topple over, top-heavy from its own expansions; leaving only the ruins and a rotten foundation.

Ilene Rosen

Ed. Note: This was written Monday night which will explain the reference to "candidates" rather than to Council members. I feel, however, that the faces expressed are still valid given the new circumstances.

THE NEED FOR A DEFINITION OF A PLACE OF LEARNING

Scholar throughout the history of university education have debated the notion of academic freedom consistently. In the last century John Henry Newman had a tug with it, and his ideas had a profound effect on the founding of this college in 1860. The Boardmen of 1866 who fretted so concerned with the passing of the "Old Bird" (see Observer, 5/24/66) as well as the "Students of the 60's", to use Mr. Livingston's term in his support of Due Process (Gradually, 3/9/66), might do well to take a look at Newman.

For Newman, the conception of academic freedom derived from a definition of "a place of learning." He defined such a place as "an assemblage of learned men, scions for their own sciences and civility of each other... brought, by familiar interchange of an intellectual power, to adjust together the claims and relations of their respective subjects of investigation." Newman distilled the students' place in this scheme: "Thus is created a pure and clear atmosphere of thoughts which the student also breathes, though in his own case he only pursues a few sciences out of the multitude.

Moreover, somehow, the "students of the 60's" have lost all conception of what, properly speaking, constitutes "a place of learning", and hence their notion of academic freedom is not worth the paper on which it is written. So preposterous have they become that they assert "rights and responsibilities" of their own, and yet at a meeting of candidates for Community Council last Monday night the only recognizable proposal was the need for ventilation of Sottery Hall during Friday night movies. These "students" speak of the desire to assist in the determinations of this institution yet they will allow in an academic setting to repugnant to them condemn a course "because the lectures are dull and all the student discovers is that he dislikes." (SFC Report on the Six Point Program, 5/19/66)

The Due Process statement on academic freedom ignores every educational advance since Abclard; it affirms not the right of students to unhindered study, but the right of a student to be a non-student. This "manifesto" identifies academic freedom with student prerogative; it reduces students as "citizens" within the academy, and citizens as "students" outside of it. When an individual violates civil code "off campus," then "the Administration should apprise students of their legal rights and offer other assistance." If, in turn, students violate academic code, then they may appeal to their "citizen rights" of freedom of speech, peaceful assembly, and the right of petition. Hence irresponsible behavior under the guise of academic freedom seeks refuge behind "student rights" when in conflict with civil law and behind "citizen rights" when it transgresses academic order.

Newman's observations, however, pose a more significant question for the "students of the 60's". Can the vitality of this institution persist when students equate academic freedom with student prerogative, when in supporting this claim they identify "citizen rights with student rights, and hence when the proper sphere of academic concern expands so commodiously as to obliterate any notion of what is properly called "learning"? Can this place of learning, or any for that matter, survive for one minute when intellectual justifies an inroads of "academic freedom"
and "student rights"? Students are not students in the academy; and citizenship for students affairs outside of it. The academy is vital only in so far as its members are willing to "adjust together the claims and relations of their respective objects of investigation."

And this was at one time the "Old Bard" -- just what Norman said it was: "a pure and clear atmosphere of thought" wherein the student perceived "the great outlines of knowledge, the principles on which it rests... as he cannot otherwise apprehend them." What unparalleled audacity it is to see the "Old Bard" as a pinching gim, Mr. "Very Old Bardian", an ombroscopic "party giving ard." But such are "the students of the 60's" who feel they deserve to receive a $3,000 education, but in reality nothing more than 3% students.

John Taylor
Letters to the Editor:

The Godly:

Among the provo,ual issues concerning Bard's return to the rustic life more remains the unresolved point of cleanliness within this supposed utopian scheme. This problem is not merely one of administrative inadequacy in the areas of facilities (washing machines) and leadership but of a relationship between personal instinct and the environment itself. There are those who have never taken a bath in the consideration of themselves as pioneers of inner freedom in parallel with Thoreau's quest. They revel in the pastoral scenery beauty, comfort, and shortcomings of life. To breathe fresh air and to catch an unformed forest girt invigorate on's senses and sensibilities. But it is a dangerous detachment from the realities of the 20th century. These matters are further complicated by the fact that Bard is no longer a community, no longer an integrated polis of individuals, that there remains only structures and men whose relationships are in a state of entropy. To a large extent the order of the surroundings has instilled a false sense of well being among the student body. It has permitted students to cherish their limited measure of freedom over their own lives and still feel content. One confronts students who proclaim a "new individuality" which in a negation of the foregoing, inevitably create a sense of mind and body. They have lost their freedom by their abstention and indifference to self and social duties in the maladjusted and self-pitying ballyhoo of their own supposed impotence.

They exist as a herd in limbs and make of their life the banality ofupon art. To those who have a sense of self-determinism and dignity who see themselves as an art form this present situation is despairing and untenable.

Steven S. Kushner

To the Editors:

Whether one accepts, rejects, or ignores the Students for a Democratic Society's philosophy, its influence on the college campus is undeniable. The Port Huron Statement, a sixty-three page "Agenda for a Generation" contains an admirable outlay of aspirations -- a healthy, happy, self-directed, stable, understanding, i.e., society. I must ask that while I do not find some mentioned conditions undesirable, the infirmity of the rational arguments upon which the whole structure rests makes the entire proposal unpalatable... The more critical observer might be tempted to regard the Port Huron Statement as a joke, intended to provide amusement for its readers as they laugh at the gullible. Thus even refraining a particular SDS position, and lending it dignity, would make one the unwary object of the great joke. This "conspiracy theory" may have its merits, but faced with the imminent hazard of being taken in, I intend to treat SDS seriously. The popularity which the arduous SDS Chapter's statement enjoys perhaps justifies such a consideration.

I am going to treat specifically the recent statement by the Bard SDS Chapter. Again I must add that I do not disagree categorically with the positions in the statement. It is the perfect lack of any clear reasoning for these positions which is particularly disturbing.

"We seek the establishment of a democracy of individual participation governed by two central aims: that the individual share in those social decisions determining the quality of his life; that society be organized to encourage independence in men and provide the media for their common participation."

Port Huron Statement, S.D.S.

"In order to further these democratic ideals, the Bard College the Bard Chapter of Students for a Democratic Society presents the following program of social and academic change."

Next follow the eleven points which supposedly would further these democratic ideals. The eleven points
are explicitly maintained to be re-
listed to the stated or implied "demo-

cratie ideal." They may be viewed as
deductions from a general concept of
democracy. Their validity in this
case could rest on the firmness of the
first principles of democracy, as de-
defined by S.D.S. and the strength of
the logic in the deductions. If a
position is going to be argued from
an ideal, that ideal must be carefully
established and clearly defined. The
steps in the deduction from the ideal
to a specific program suggestion must
be made explicitly. It is evident
that neither the ideals, nor the log-
cal relationship between the ideals
and the program, are recently express-
ed.

Perhaps the authors of the Bard
S.D.S. statement were really not
concerned so much with ideals and
offered the quote as merely "rein-
forcement" to views held independent
of those ideals. The program may have
been suggested because the eleven
points, regardless of their origin or
of their ultimate sanction asimple-
meners of "the ideal", are worth-
while in an operational sense. The
forth statement might serve as an
example to clarify this point.

4. The national minimum wage should
be paid to all students and non-
students who are employed by
Bard College.

Just what is meant by this? Obvious-
ly the employees under consideration
are protected by the national minimum
wage law. They do not receive $1.25
per hour as that wage as defined by
the law, it is not binding in their
specific circumstance. Employers can
comply with the law without paying
every employee $1.25 per hour. Thus
the problem is concerned not so much
with the Federal minimum wage as with
the establishment of a Bard College
minimum wage.

No reasons are given that would
convince the reader that it is at all
practical to raise these wages. Per-
haps fewer jobs would be available at
$1.25 per hour as the labor is not
worth that much. As no evidence is
given in support of the practical
possibility of such a pay increase,
I con simply outflank S.D.S. by de-
manding $3.00 per hour. Perhaps if
practical reasons were given for the
proposal, based on empirical evidence
and not just "should", it might re-
ceive serious consideration.

Before putting an exciting list
of proposals, some careful thought
and investigation should take place.
There is at least some empirical evi-
dence which can be offered. Certainly
a platform with no reasons stated for
its validity, and no convincing evi-
dence for its practicability, will
receive little attention as far as its
implementation is concerned.

John K. MacDonald

These bringing with suggestions
might at least consider existing
conditions and thus issue state-
mants with more relevance. The
reasons why a position is taken
are just as important, if not more
important than the position itself.