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COUNCIL ALLOWS OVER $16,000 TO EIGHTY-ONE ORGANIZATIONS; ELICTS TWO COMMITTEES

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

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

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

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

Finally Council reached the main matter of business, the appropriations for twenty-five campus organizations. The total requested budget was $23,000, the Budget Committee recommended that they receive $14,000, and it was up to Council to make the final decision. Council had some $20,147 in the Treasury (including over $6,000 from last semester), and $1,754 already committed to organizations for this semester. Council allotted the following sums to 21 organizations: they did not allot the Jewish Speakers Committee any money, and postponed the requests of the Radio Station, and the Red Balloon.
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DROPPED EYES OF THE "IDLE"

"The food at Dining Commons serves a good purpose—it takes the students' attention away from the Administration"

--overheard at a dinner held at the President's House.

************************

------
I am touched by Mr. Naylor and Miss Hausmann's concern that all should tread the path of truth. But I fear that they, in their zeal, have themselves arrayed from the straight and narrow. I cannot understand what the ambiguities were, in my article, to which they refer in their recent letter to the Observer. Aside from a few flights of rhetorical fancy, I feel that my article was quite straightforward. They do not, in their letter, manage to deny the truth of either of the statements of mine which they claim to refute. The fact that all the members of Council approved of Mr. Edmunds' candidacy for the chairmanship does not alter the fact that no election was held and, hence, no votes were cast in his favor. The fact that Council has a Constitutional right to fill vacancies when they occur does not alter the fact that they executed their mandated duty with little or no regard for the wishes of the electorate as epitomized in the previous term's election. Let the flabby of my argument et voila Mr. Naylor and Miss Hausmann, I advocate a Constitutional reform which would establish a more demonstrative means of filling Council vacancies.

While I am on the subject of fact versus fiction, I should like to point out a few problems in this connection which have been raised by the candidates in the past. The representatives of the Observer, who defended that publication's objectivity and standards of journalism before Council, fail to mention that their candidates' previous articles have been more about the "product of a closed mind." I have in my possession a list of 53 names of members of this community who have contributed letters or articles to the Observer. This list will be published in the Observer next week.

The Observer's standards of journalism and quality of writing do not, apparently, extend to its headlines. In the most recent issue we find "news articles" headlined "ASSEMBLY DOUBTS ST. PAUL PRO. ARMS BILL RULING, "HOW TO ELIMINATE OBSCURE ARTICLES," and "IF COUNCIL (note how the Observer, in its august objectivity, devotes an entire separate article to its own request.)". Moreover, the Observer is sometimes more than a sort of mor rissey play in which the forces of Good triumph over the forces of Evil," "LITTLE WOMEN PRESSED ON COMPLAINTS," "CONSTITUTIONALITY OF RULES RECOMMENDED BY JURY EMBARGO ON NO JUNIOR CURB." I am astonished
that Mr. Kahn ceased polemizing long enough to give an accurate count of the vote at the assembly meeting.

I will not tire my readers by pointing out the preponderance of inflammatory editorializing in what purports to be a news medium, nor will I discuss the errors of fact and other aberrations in the lead editorial. Although I would not question the right of any organization or individual to criticize the Gadvly, I would submit that the Observer's periodic eruptions regarding our humble publication would carry greater weight if it concerned itself more with evolving into a responsible news journal and less with the prostituting of its resources by certain highly vocal political fringe groups on campus.

Jeffrey T. Mortimer

THE NOTRE DAME SPIRIT HITS BAND

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

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

As he stood before his players with his face two shades redder than usual, he spoke: "Citizens! I stand before thee and I am prepared for the indignation and humiliation of which I am the object, but I know the causes. A man may personally be well off and yet, if his team is defeated, he is defeated with it. Think that the team has lost the honor of the Faculty. Why hast thou played so badly?" Up to this point he paused and gazed coldly at his players: "O Zeus, king of the gods, what have I done to deserve this fate? If thou wilt that my star player, Terry Dewsnup, breaks his leg, I'll buy this, but what have I done to deserve the wrath of all the inhabitants of Mt. Olympus? Why are these BUBS playing so badly?" With this, you could see him in the lichen as if he had heard from his Oracle. Again he paused and said: "Citizens, I say no more. It has been said before, but for your edification, I shall repeat... the Macedonians are coming! Let's win this one for Terrence Dewsnup!" The last sound of his laconic speech, the players rose and with tears in their eyes, proceeded to win the game. It remains to be seen what Mt. Olympus has in store for the faculty team.

Stratus Patrackis

AT THE OTHER EXTREME

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

That, however, was all past history. Now, it seems, the clubs have whole-heartedly adopted Council's policy of the committed speaker. Groups like the Literature club and Ecclesia at Collegium came before Council last Monday night with lists of speakers and other such financial commitments. Council has not added to the other extreme. Because of the numerical proliferation of campus organizations and the limitations set by the fixed amount of Convocation dues, Council was forced to pare down drastically the financial requests of all the organizations. Many of the chairmen will have to return to their speakers and make excuses as to why not, after arrangements apparently have been scheduled, the clubs will have to cancel out of the agreement.

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

Ilene Rosen

WHAT IS TO BE DONE or WHETHER the WEATHER??

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

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

We must consider the future and ask ourselves: what are our true purposes. While we might not all agree on the form that it would take our ideal should be to establish a system of weather control which would run accurately enough to free us to pursue higher considerations than studying and swimming. The first step toward such a system is to eliminate the present confusion by eliminating the duality of power, rather than vote on the present proposal we must offer the Weatherman a decision: either he does the creating and becomes responsible for the success or failure of the weather, or we do.

If the Weatherman decided to take on the responsibility of the weather then it would remain pretty much the same as it is. In the mean time the community will continue to be buried under 3 feet of snow for the remainder of the season.

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

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

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

JOIN US IN OUR REBELLION AGAINST THE WEATHERMAN

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

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

This meeting is sanctioned by SLUSH:

(The Student League, Unitizing Sunshine and Health) Marcia Rich
Jeffrey Mortimer Ilene Rosen (based on an idea by Jane Hill)

THE SCORN OF FORTUNE

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

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

Skeptics to all ideas, including, and especially our own, we have...for suffered a pang when ideas of some other imbeciles permeate. It is impossible for us to get any glow out of such hallucinations as "student rights" and "academic freedom." For if you pump out all the slop which usually accompanies such protestations, you find that they are invariably grounded in the inferior man's hatred of the guy who has a bit more intelligence. There is one honest impulse behind the protest for "student rights", and that is the impulse to punish the man with the superior capacity for study--to bring him down to the miserable level of a self-indulging buffoon; i.e., of a stupid, but ever-opinioned, ever-protesting, loudmouth. And there is only one argument for academic freedom, and that is the argument that it free some of us from academics.

Fantagruelians, there are some rearguard moralizing Babbits among us. Perhaps half, if not all the sorrows of the world are caused by their false assumptions. Witness their logic: hypocrisy is the cardinal sin to the moral life; social regulations breed hypocrisy; ergo, do away with social regulations. All in favor say "Aye". Or try this on for size: "Morally, the use of any rules to stifle free speech is indefensible": free speech was stifled last Wednesday night; ergo, to restore free speech, eliminate the rules. "Ah, me",--to use Mr. Leasing's refrain.

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

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

First, for the heads to decamp to the Walpurgis Nacht, that meeting of the assembly, for having to pledge a spurious oath of good faith to the Trustees, and finally, for having given a group of forty students the excuse to force an incident like the "sit-in": HPC had better take heed: either it takes proper disciplinary action against the forty violators of the "sit-in" flasgo, or they had better batten down the hatches for a stormy spring semester.

Perhaps, then, Fantagruelians, all we have in our quality of spirit, which, as Bobstia said, consists in "a certain jollity of mind, picked in the scorn of fortune."

John A. Paylor

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

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

Please turn to p. 6 for a special Goodguys vs. Badguys Elliott.
BLAST YOUR FAVORITE GOOD-GUY AND BAD-GUY!!! CHOOSE ONE FROM EACH COLUMN.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FOR THE OFFICIAL GOOD-GUY</th>
<th>FOR THE OFFICIAL BAD-GUY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jeff Rochlis</td>
<td>Bruce Bieberman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Edmonds</td>
<td>Harvey Fleetwood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andy Krieger</td>
<td>Linda Holdt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>And the entire cast of NPC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Irene Rosen
Nicola Rich