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Clutching At The Little Rubber Duckie of Power

It seems that, whenever I write an article whose main purpose is not much-needed conservation or social reform on the Bard campus, I find myself going to bat for the Observer. Last term it was "Going Down for the Third Time," and the topic was student apathy and nonsupport of the newspaper. In fact, this term the topic is... well, that isn't it precisely. The fact remains that we are effectively bankrupt. But put that aside for the moment.

How the editorial policy of the Observer (in case you were wondering about its presence, absence or nature), as set forward in Going Down, and which we have attempted to practise, is to provide, over and above news, an impartial forum in which any and all community opinion can find expression. Despite the bias of the editorial staff in one matter or another, which you may have noticed our lack of qualms about stating, we realize the obligation to print rebuttals and other material with which we disagree. We do, in fact, even solicit such material for reasons which I mentioned in Going Down—"there is something about a printer's devil that startles clarity out of people," and the necessity of using lucid language which must stand or fall on its own merits makes it possible for the community to observe and evaluate those merits.

Videliciet. In this issue we have articles displaying various shades of opinion about the Student Senate, especially the recent Budget Referendum brouhaha; there is also some writing, much of it cogent and worthy, evoked by my review of Lear. There is a comment, from our new Senate reporter, which would probably have been downright influential...
Contingency! Philip N. Carducci

Contingency, the end of all the student body's worries about what their club will get from Senate. Well I hate to inform the student body, but as of March 13th, 1974, the contingency fund was down to about $700.

The reason for this low sum of money is that clubs and societies who received a good deal of money from the students are asking for more and say they didn't get enough.

For example, one club who will remain nameless received about $1100 from both the student body and the contingency fund. This club had to go back to Senate and ask for an additional $500. They only received $300, but they never gave Senate a clear description of what they were going to do with the money, and what they did describe didn't sound all that great.

In contrast, another club came to Senate and described exactly what it wanted extra money for, and they even quoted prices. Their club is basically a new club on campus, but at least they know what honesty is.

The Observer is in the same situation as the above club. We have enough for at least one more issue after this one; then we have to go to Senate for contingency funds. By the time we get to go to Senate the contingency fund will probably be $0. This means we're out of business.

A school without a paper is like watching television without turning on the sound. It's hard to understand what is going on by just looking at the image on the screen, so you would turn up the sound to get a better idea of what's happening. The same is true with a newspaper. We must have a newspaper to realize what the situation means in other people's point of view. You might not always agree with other people's point of view, but it pays to know where you stand.

I see something on television that you don't like you turn it off. Well, a newspaper is exactly the same; if you don't like what you read you turn the page. The Observer realizes that it doesn't please everybody, but we try our best. We are only human, and if that's a fault, we're sorry.

What we would like from our readers is a sign of support. Such as, if you disagree with an article or have suggestions on how to serve the Bard Community better, let us know.

Remember, there are only eight persons working on the paper on a full time basis. We do our best, but we need the student body's help. We might be out of business soon, as far as printing a bi-weekly, paper, but we'll still be around this year and back again printing next year.

Contingency is what every club should be on if the student budget is to be distributed fairly. I'll take one less division of the budget law now in effect. We should all get our fair share, but the way things are now, it's a one sided affair.

TO ALL YOU ANIMAL LOVERS

The Bard Community has a reputation and history of being negligent, irresponsible, and cruel to animals. The pathetic thing is that this is not a description of some distant, past Bard Community. It is a present reality.

Last summer one cat died and another almost died of starvation due to it, I believe, a student relinquishing his responsibilities. The grim and ghastly statistics of previous summers and fall periods reach 10 or 15 abandoned cats and dogs. You are not fortunate enough to be taken in by Mrs. Coons, the woman in the bookstore, the maids, or someone in Ludlow, met none too pleasant dogs frozen under benches or trapped in rooms.

The Pet Commission does not make rules for the sake of having rules. (Though Richard Todesco seems to feel this about rules.) They are guidelines we have drawn from bad past experiences and for the protection of the animals. Nightly I foresee sad circumstances coming this year as the dorms are becoming filled with kittens & puppies--cats and dogs who no doubt will be statistics come Sept. 1st. Don't you UNDERSTAND—that kittens and puppies grow up and live for years? That you should not only expect them to be in midterm, but also your dorm members and your responsibility for as long as you own them? Domesticated cats just don't survive when it's time for them to get their fur out of their "natural environment." Dogs just don't find new masters. They get run over and if they're lucky, killed instantly. They go hungry for days or weeks. They get ill or get mauled or even eaten by other half-crazed, starving animals. THE PAIN IS IT THEY SUFFER,... and they can't do anything about it. They are prey to a Bard resident's frivolous whim of wanting a "friend." Well, friends shouldn't leave their puppy "friends" outside at 8 weeks old to fend for itself against 10 full grown dogs. Friends don't leave their kitten "friends" crying in their room all day and evening. Friends don't throw their animal "friends" from Dinkling Commons and expect them to be getting a nutritional meal. If you really want to be a friend to animals, if you really love animals, then think about it a long, long time before you get an animal, before you bring he/she up to Bard, and before you abandon him/her up here as another potential dead body.

(Nick Scarrishaw do you still believe the animals on Bard campus have the best deal?)

Lynn Tepper

The Observer regrets that, due to money and space limitations, a few of the articles submitted for this issue had to be partly cut. We tried to keep the sense intact while doing so and hope the writers will understand.

UPCOMING THEATRE PRODUCTIONS: March 23-25, in Preston, DEB will present "Social Claustrophobia," an original one-act musical by Lily Cross. This is the first thing of its kind to happen at Bard in some time—an original student work—and all are encouraged to come.
A REPLY TO SNOWBALLS

We were rather amused recently at the loquacious rambles of one well-known member of the upper college at Bard with respect to snowball and noise violations, at retention, etc. Being somewhat interested in the subject ourselves, we plunged into Mr. Tedesco's article with considerable concentration, hoping to see the list of such violations reviewed, their facts laid bare, and their perpetrators pinned under the scrutiny of public reprobabion. We were, however, rather disappointed when the timely and controversial subject of Mr. Tedesco's investigation disintegrated into sundry personal harangues and conclusions ex non lucendo.

Our disappointment was, furthermore, paralleled by some stronger emotions when it became evident that his mislaid, non sequitur concord and journalistic sensibilities, were at an unequalled, often inaccurate, facts. This unfortunate miscarriage of journalism was compounded by the introduction of Mr. Tedesco's personal fictions and fantasies.

We briefly review his confessions:

We initially encounter some cheerless reminiscences about how it was in the good old days at Bard; no parking or firearms. Oh, nobody believed in guns back then and nobody really cared about the animals. With tears in our eyes, we remembered the happy times of Buffy and Cyril-the-lame-bird found rummaging through dinner jars.

Now our perusal brings us to the bombshell: he asks: "Why (do) college administrations have such a propensity for creating useless rules which should never function as rules in any case? Aside from a wince at the sentence structure per se of this question, we were forced to acknowledge the legitimacy and appropriateness of such.

Mr. Tedesco attempts now to guide us through the mysteries of "the long deceptive history of the security office" where, "it is no secret," "Mr. DeFil is students working for him who aren't officially, ethically, working for him.

We might raise an eyebrow and question Mr. Tedesco's use of the word "ethically" here, but no, no nitpicking. A serious issue has been raised: Students, not on the college payroll, actually informing on other students? Actually in collusion with the "EI-choke-Hudsons?"

Tedesco, however, refrains from explanatory digressions and, aside from briefly touching upon the problem of "the sale of certain substances," and the menace of what he plunges ahead into the matter of noise violations...

The conclusion that Mr. Tedesco reaches we must assume, is implicit in his final distinguishing among "obscuration(s) of priorities." Now despite Mr. Tedesco's undeniably refined literary and journalistic sensibilities, we were forced to a somewhat different conclusion. That is, that his self-described "unduly critical, grape-sht" was simply unduly inaccurate horseshit. Experience teaches us that while Timmiesrados raise some truly important questions about the style and quality of life at Bard, he is simply unaware of, or chooses to ignore the facts.

Knowing Mr. Tedesco to be a man-about-campus and one who has had himself some dealings with the administration and especially with Mr. DeFil, we must conclude that he has chosen to ignore and misrepresent the facts.

It is our own opinion that, though rules per se exist, indeed with any limb of our legislators, there exists at Bard one fundamental rule. It is not only a rule of common sense and necessity (Hesiod says: "The gods themselves have said: the art of war in the cradle, as a last resort of the civilized"），but that Mr. DeFil and Dean Sugatt have unwaveringly committed themselves to enforcing. That rule is: THOU SHALT NOT BE AN ASSHOLE. Naturally at a place like Bard, such a rule is violated constantly. But all other rules aside, this one rule is the one we must make as an agreement between peers that we will not be assholes.

Elucidating the facets and functionings of this rule is beyond the scope of this comment. It might be suggested that, if you need to paint yourself as an asshole, and that seems getting caught too, you have Mr. DeFil and Dean Sugatt to help you back to the paths of virtue (Hesiod says: "The gods put sweeten on the paths to virtue.")? It isn't nice to know that when Pat DeFil busts you, you are not really busted?

As for Mr. Tedesco, it is not our place to judge his actions, past or present. He knows if he is an asshole, and we are certain that Mr. DeFil and Dean Sugatt know it.

Respectfully,
John James Dalton

Fear & Loathing in Albee Social

There are a number of marvelously tempting mistakes one may make while attempting to write an article on the student senate. I have little doubt that I will stumble into a few I have not foreseen but I would, at any rate, like to say a few things about the nature of student senate at Bard.

First I would like to examine Big Mistake #1, which is linguistic, and runs something like this: "Democracy cannot work in an atmosphere of apathy. The senate seems to operate in a vacuum; students by and large do not attend meetings. Conclusion: the modus operandi is apathy. This is senate defense position #1. It has enough truth in it to convince those who wish to be convinced, but, in the main, it is unmitigated garbage. In 3 years here I have been struck by the fact that almost everyone I know is concerned about the quality of life here and would like to see how all act on that concern. With the vast majority of the students involved in drama productions, clubs, and/or committees, it seems silly to say Bard students don't care. With this in mind, I would like to move on to my next point: Big Mistake #2, which also has enough truth in it to represent the facts. It goes about like this: "The student senate is a group of elitists who have no further goal in life but to attain the trappings of every ounce of authority they can get." There are three wonderfully derailed assumptions here: 1) That no one on the senate was REALLY elected by the student body. 2) That no one on the senate is among those concerned individuals mentioned above, but rather, as of the moment of their election were somehow transformed into advocates of that concern. And 3) What senators are a megalomaniacal contingent of brats whose only concern in life is to feed the delusion that they are "important." I suppose it is good to remember that Big Mistake #1 tends to perpetuate Big Mistake #2, and vice versa. The students become disenfranchised with the senate, i.e., "student government here is a farce." And the senate becomes disenfranchised with the student body, i.e., "the only time we ever see them is when they need money." The question I keep wanting to ask is: how can the student body and the senate as a single unit transcend the structural crap and get down to the business of making Bard a better place to live?

When I joined senate this semester it had already gone a long way toward losing all credibility. Needless to say, things have not been helped by the senate's bungling with the budget. As I was as responsible as anyone else, I think it's the confusion arose out of the senate's sincere desire to do the right thing, but simply not...
dure, combined with the white liberal guilt syndrome (I hate to say it, but it is the truth, isn't it?), which resulted in Matteawan receiving more of the total in the student allocations, right behind the Film Committee.

On the other hand, virtually every large ($1000 and up) organization received extremely low allocations in relation to their budget needs. The extreme example was that of the Musical Activities Group, whose concerts are usually held heavily attended—and which received a total of $400. One of the reasons the student body, perhaps embarrassed, put on one concert. In any case, when the time came for the Budget Committee to allocate the remaining $8000.00, a handful of groups—the Film Committee and the Latin American Organization—dominated the proceedings to the point of overwhelming them. In most of these cases, these extra allocations, ranging from $900.00 to $2200 (for the Entertainment Committee) were necessary simply in order for the groups involved to put on some semblance of a program. (The Spring Formal, for example, will cost something like $1800 to put on.)

What this all means is that the experimental allocation program must end in the sense that all these inequities may have been produced, but on the whole it was a case of an underfunded student body making mistakes that had to be corrected at the whim and will of a necessary jury—the Budget Committee. But that's not all. After this process had finally been completed, the Student Senate had to ratify the budget which they did in short order. They listened to the complaints of those groups which felt offended by the size of their allocations, or, rather, the lack of size. Most of this business was handled—several clubs, including the OBSERVER, asked for extra money from the Senate's Contingency Fund and got it, although the Marxist Studies group did not. The two pieces of budget business this Senate meeting could be considered extraordinary: First, the Traditional Music group, whose allocations totaled less than $800.00, claimed that there must have been some kind of miscounting of the student allocations ballots because their own members and their friends remembered contributing more than the $24.75 they supposedly have received from the students. They also asked for a guarantee of the extra $100.00 they would need to actually perform a concert this semester. The decision of the Student Senate in this case was that since the issue of miscounting had been raised, it was now the duty of the Folk and Traditional Music Society to count the ballots and find out how much they actually got—and the issue of letting the group put on a concert was immediately tabled for a week. The other piece of business for Senate to consider here was a budget appeal by the Black Student Organization, which received a total of $1200.00 in the allocations and was asking for another $400.00. A resolution to give them $300.00 was quickly made and passed; another resolution, to give them the other $100.00, with a tie vote but was passed when Kate Wittenstein, presiding over the meeting, used her power to break the tie. What was unusual about this case was not the allocation but the fact that the BBSO now has the power to spend more money than they could last semester. And, if my memory of the meeting is correct, the senators did not question the Black request as closely as some of the other students present.

Finally, Folk and Trad, went ahead and re-counted those ballots—and discovered that there was a mistake, to the tune of $40.00. As a result, the group was able to go to Senate and get the money they wanted to put on their concert. But this could not change the fact that the new budget system would have to be changed back. It's as simple as this—the Student Senate is an elitist group almost by definition, and they're going to continue putting things up something badly (like right now. That contingency fund is almost gone already!). And nobody has come up yet with a better system to clear out that until somebody does, it's "you lose" either way.

—Sol Louis Siegel

A COMMENTARY BY BARBARA WHITEMAN

The Bard Black Students Organization received $420.70 in student allocations. While that amount, $990.00, from a Senate allotment. They submitted a budget for $3,025, the 3rd largest in the school, surpassed only by the Entertainment and Film Committees. They weren't satisfied with 1502.70, and appeared before the Senate to ask for an additional $400, arguing that they need additional money to support their organization. This is exactly the way blacks are treated by Bard, since they feel that all Bard students have been most transplanted from their cultural background. The BBSO was also treated a lot like a phone. They explained that they felt they required it to keep in touch with other black students in the area colleges. I know the Observer could use extra money to call the printers and keep in touch with college newspaper editors in the area, but somehow we manage.

A question arose about the necessity of having two bands at the last BBSO dance. They explained that a battle of the bands was an "integral part of our black cultural background," and justified the expense. Well, that at least something we have in common; battles of the bands are a part of my cultural background too—we had them in my little New England high school I attended.

But as I was saying, the BBSSO wanted 3400 more. Their spokesman implied, by saying such things as "I don't know why we call the BBSSO by discrimination" and "I've had a feeling though I don't want to mention any names" that if the Senate did not give them what they asked they would be demonstrating racism. The Senate was intimidated and gave them the 400—actually, first allotted them 3300 and later decided to give them another 700. The Senate raised the BBSSO Fund to $1,702.70. The BBSSO spokesman walked out before the vote for the second sum was even explained.

There is a sound rationale for supporting the BBSSO Fund in case of vocal students or minority, this is trying to script against between $100 and $150 together so that they can hire a performer. At last night's meeting the Senate gave them $60 over the 65,75 the students had donated. At the same meeting they gave the L.A.U. 30,000 to add to the already totaling $1,075.00.

I too have been removed from my cultural background; I chose to come to Bard for that purpose. But if the BBSSO isn't happy with that 3,027 some friends and I would like to do it because for a long time we've wanted to express our views as a minority. We are going to call ourselves the Swiss Protestant Students Organization and we've been looking for an old Presbyterian Church, white clapboard with a bell and a steeple with a clock in it, to put in the Blithewick garden. There are towns that will give you one—they usually want to build a working lot or something like that and promise to keep it in repair.

I strongly feel that both the BBSSO and the L.A.U. should continue to be supported by the Senate and student body. That I agree that the Senate stop discriminating against those student groups which are neither black nor Latin American.
tory in the Red Tide days (if it had even found print); my hopes are that both the community and the newspaper are mature enough by now to handle all issues as they should be handled, with their minds and in their Anglo-Saxon vocabularies. (I except the immortal Seymour Shuffling. But then, they apply their kind of language to my editors constantly, the difference being that, more important to give the reasons for my sentiments.)

So much for what we have had to offer so far, but this function as a forum, the newspaper is a valuable tool for the circulation of information. Excessive sums of money are spent in this school for the printing of memorabilia and senatorial labors and publications. At least some of these could be shunted into our pages, putting more of the information in a single, less forgettable place. It would be, at least, if the funds already set aside for their printing were shunted to us as well, to help keep going.

Well, the money has to come somewhere. Consider this. We are already in debt in the approximate amount of $400. A staggering $1200 was granted us by such students as both the Senate and the ASB. And up to date, $400 by Senate, then $200 more when the editors appeared in the school and were met with the next meeting. This gives us about $528 in the red, not counting our $15 on a 6-page number... well, work it out for yourself.

The only solution at this point seems to be throwing ourselves upon the mercy of the court. We can reach some kind of reciprocal agreement over notices with the Senate and Ludlow, if people would care to do right or, in kind, to list on your income tax "all other expense for Bard Observer, $6 charitable deductions", if people will help us with fundraising ideas... maybe we can make it.

And still, most of all, your work is needed. Your opinions, your reactions, your criticisms and you. I may discover, as many already have, that to write your ideas is to find things in your mind that you never even knew were there. And that's one of the most important things we're here for.

Karen E. Murray

(EDITORIAL NOTE: This is the first in a continuing series of columns by our new Senate reporter, Barbara Whitman. She will be sitting in on Senate meetings weekly, reducing her observations into a combination of factual reporting and content, in the hopes that the working of this body may be brought closer to everyone at Bard. As with all articles we print, your comment or inquiry is encouraged.)

THE SENATE REPORTER

What first impresses one onto entering the life of the Student Senate is the tremendous bureaucracy of the thing. There are two co-presidents who split a salary, a paid secretary, a treasurer, and a leg to pay last week although the amount of her salary has not been worked out, and an innumerable committee and committees, chairpeople who take care of things like budgets, and campaigns and complaints. If you have a problem they know just who to send you to.

Another thing that will strike you in the idealism and sincerity of the senators. At times I may doubt the depth of their insight into the general opinions of the student body, but they are very conscious of their roles as your representatives. They also have a refreshing sense of fairness. Case in point. Shelly Weinstock, the treasurer, after the Senate had already allocated some $700, contributed some practical sense by reminding everyone that the contingency fund is not bottomless and that it should not all be allotted at once. It is, after all, a fund set aside for unexpected expenditures and for clubs unsure of the sums they will need. After the ASB received $400, a sum which dipper rather deeply into the fund, the senators naturally became less willing to disperse more; Shelly spoke up again, implying the necessity of balancing the students' needs with fiscal prudence, pointing out that the Senate does not run its allocation system on a first come, first serve basis. A wise move for the club (some because they solicit money after you have just spent some $700 is quite human, but not very fair. There was a brief pause of startled introspection among the Senate after Shelly's suggestion.

But in spite of its large governmental structure and all that fairness and sincerity, the Senate is an infant organization. There are the many little blunders; some sheets being used at one meeting which listed club financial requests and Senate allocations were so incorrect that they had to be disapproved; the meeting for students to donate their money was so exasperatingly inefficient that it is not surprising some $2500 were not raised; students - the Senate simply made it too difficult to give one's money away.

But Senate ineptness manifest itself in more serious matters. The idea of the referendum which permitted students to allocate 1/3 of their convocation fees was conceived in the Senate and passed by the student body. After all, however, the Senate discovered a clause in the constitution which led them to believe that any amendment to the constitution had to be passed by 2/3 of a quorum of the Senate. (Apparently no one had checked before to see if the referendum was legal.) For this reason the Senate "invalidated or ignored" it. This year however, another clause discovered by the Student Senate, a passage of such an amendment by the student community, and thus the Senate "reinstated or recognized" the referendum.

A serious mistake was made in counting student donations. Bruce Poli, president of the Folk and Traditional Music Society, concluded after talking with supporters that his club had been given more by students than Senate acknowledged. The Senate figure was 24.75; Bruce believed that it should have been over $50. He was snickering suggesting the checks were faked, to save face, might have exaggerated their donations. Bruce was willing to forget the whole thing, wanting only another $100 or so that his club could begin to engineer itself as possible. But the Senate had been charged with a serious offense and insisted that the ballots be recounted. Bruce was right. The Folk and Traditional Music Society had been given $56.75 by the student community.

I heard the outcome of the recount from a friend who shook her head and said "Watergate at Bard." I can't agree with that. The Student Senate as a whole does not want to treat anyone unfairly; it does not have the organization required for such corruption, nor the temperament. That does not excuse their ineptitude, but I'd rather deal with inept sincerity than the hard core partisanship that breeds Watergate.
appreciate good, and I think the review of " Lear" in the last Observer may be a case in point. To be sure, the review cited some good aspects of the production, but in a generally derogatory frame which I feel deprived me of the chance to see the play in performance. The main points one could have made are: the way the play is so powerful that only a very bad performance could damage it, which the production at Bard certainly was not. The character lines would have kept me to the end of the performance, and the various aspects of the particular performance can only enhance the viewer's perspective. It is true that Osian summoned a strong, rich, and consistent Lear - a great, bewildered, primordial man. Lynn, Hilaria, Jane, and others also carried their parts with a sensitivity and consistent strength which a Bard colleague, who seems them in class and in dining rooms, should have appreciated.

That's another opportunity which the Observer reviewer seems to have missed. That bard actors are relatively young and often present potential disadvantage, but that they are peers and colleagues offsets that. The audience, knowing persons personally, can get inside their heads and more easily appreciate the ramifications of an interpretation processed through familiar channels.

Which brings up another point. One mark of Shakespeare's is that he is timeless; no writer of eternal human problems. " Lear" is not destroyed by relinquishing the props of an elaborate performance. Staging, motions, and costumes should be dramatic, meaningful, and alive, to enhance the play. They need not be the Globe Theatre.

As for the set, Bill Draper used richly the full possibilities of the unit stage, which one might notice was the basis of all productions last term. This is an economy measure and also a tour de force - to make the most out of what you've got. And with an intricately constrained French verse form, to approximate this you must be somewhat knowledgeable and willing: if you come to it resentfully you will certainly get nothing from it. Apparently this term that same stroke of genius has been completely reworked into a theater in the round - for the entire term. Both audience and drama-dance students will have the opportunity to explore a different approach to the use of that space.

The symbolic simplicity of the costumes conveyed in a non-aggressive way the universal humanity of the characters. This was emphasized by the progressive disrobing of the good guys as the drama approaches its end. In other productions, different length hose robes have served as well.

Finally, Lynn Hopper played Cordelia and the fool very well, and Bill Driver was not revealing something which the wise reader or viewer would not realize by himself to have her play both. After all, Cordelia could not become the fool as Edgar becomes Tom o'Bedlam that isn't possible under the constraints of the story - but the same actor may well have played both parts in Shakespeare's original production. It's a symbolic identification which comes across well as it was done.

I attend most Bard productions and I see mostly the same people in the audience, time after time. Some people may stay away because of the kind of attitude I suggested at the beginning. It's easy enough: be courteous, damn the reviewers (both formal and casual), bring a try, with an open mind. It's a shame to waste the opportunity.

MARIO DONATELLI

Raps on theatre objectives...

This is written for the Bard Theatre Department, whoever that may be, in hopes that it will awaken to the fact that the situation is part of a not natural but a historic process and therefore subject to the laws of change, as long as one basic, instinctive movmt is not continually denied. The review which have appeared in response to Bard productions indicate a serious failure of most of those productions to reach the audience. For anyone interested in theatre this is a warning which should concern them both least and most. It is certainly not the time to throw the costume consciousness of their armor shoulders and carry on the fine incorruptible, incomprehensible 'tradition'. The sense of fragmentation in the department, as well as the frustration of actors and spectators, should not masquerade as an abominable whim of that devilish theater, but be subject to the same scientific scrutiny to which the department relating to that concerning those who operate it. Is it not a theatre of a certain, one of education, of social comment; there is only one, the language which seems the spectators imagination.

Our personalities provide us with sufficient evidence of the disparities which one organism of a body; theatre allows us to see the muscular insufficiency of humanity which we can no longer deny. Not by assuming traits, obscure and arbitrary symbols, but the responsibility which first made between actors and spectators that is not a theatre of entertainment, one of education, one of social comment; there is only one, the language which seems the spectators imagination.

The actor's process is therefore perfect, is not a theatre of entertainment, one of education, one of social comment; there is only one, the language which seems the spectators imagination.

The actor's process is therefore perfect, is not a theatre of entertainment, one of education, one of social comment; there is only one, the language which seems the spectators imagination.
have exposed my convictions about theatre, but even among students with differing opinions I find a great degree of discontent with the way this powerful machinery perpetuates itself without ever questioning its own efficiency. That theatre is a crossroad is evident; that any one system must yield to the exclusion of others at such a college as Bard, I find difficult to accept.

In one student-directed production in which I was involved the audience was physically affected by what occurred on stage. To the few actors left onstage it seemed as if they were surrounded by an endless sea which would at any moment rise and finally crush them. But was the audience watching who? And what was performing? What had happened to the awakened mind?

For those who share the mind-space of people I have worked in Bard theatre, I apologize. We share a knowledge of how little we have done, and how much remains to accomplish.

Mario Donatelli

from p. 3

knowing what that was. "The right thing" turns out to be a diluted combination of 1) what the students want 2) what the constitution allows 3) what is plausible. It was plain that the students wanted the new bus system. New York. It got the constitution more ambiguous on the matter, and the plausibility of the system has been severely questioned by most everyone else, but it was our call.

The Senate Newsletter, which I have been putting out once a while, has been an attempt to bring back that sense of dialogue between senate and student body. It is obvious that for this to work the newsletter must be read and that students make their views known on issues by coming to meetings. Perhaps it is possible for all of us to make a fresh beginning by being open to each other's point of view.

-Lindsay Hill

filmSpeak

J. SCHER

The other day, in a friend's room, I noticed two boxes of Ektachrome EP 16mm film. Written on each box was the number 15. I asked what that meant, and he replied that it was the price in dollars that he paid for the film at the FotoForm. Now, this quite startling fact is in contrast to the advertised retail price for this film at $7.66/roll, so do the Bookstore come up with a figure like this? This is an approximate $15.50 from the manufacturer, which is the same price as the Bill's Department of the Film Department, which they are selling it to.

I found this outrageous, and asked the saleswoman at the Bookstore about it. She had no explanation, and was annoyed at my questioning the price. I have been told that the money the Bookstore makes goes toward scholarship funds. However, I question the sort of Robin Hood tactics here employed--ripping the rich off the rich. With the justification of giving it back to the poor. Film is so expensive that anyone doing serious work is poor enough, having spent every cent twice over, to assume they have money to come back like that is insulting to say the least. Even worse, to assume students will charge the film, leaving parents to pick up the tab, is certainly unjustifiable.

The Bookstore is charging these outrageous prices as a result of poor purchasing on their part, and that I don't see no reason to pay them. Order film from Kodak direct and save almost half. Let the bookstore keep its film till either they lower the prices or it rotates on the shelves.

---That over with, I'd like to suggest something that doubtless needs little publicity among many but would not suffer from more: Upstate Film Follies. It's located in Rhinebeck, sandwiched between the Library and Foster's. What the school lacks in comfort for the posterior the films more than surpass in pleasure for the anterior. The price, $1.50, is comforting as well. There should be a new schedule out soon; I'll post a copy on the OBSERVER floor should anyone miss it. In any event the phone # is 876-2451 should you wish to call about times or shows.

"YES, IT CAME!"

Not since the dark days of Black February, 1972, has there been such a mess. Of those of you who remember, Black February was that awful period when five movies failed to arrive in the mail in time to be shown on schedule in the Settory Hall. The new crisis period began in early March when Two or Three Things I Know About Her, the Godard film, came on time, but the sound system was not working. So we had to show it with a 'scope lense that fit in Settory--an attempt which failed along with the projector's sound system. The Birds was brought in as a replacement--the soundtrack on the print turned out to be fouled up during a crucial scene. But at least it could be projected on the regular Settory projectors.

Less than a week later, Last Holiday got fouled up, but it did come on the last possible mail day before the scheduled showing. And, as if this weren't enough, it suddenly turned out that the Committee couldn't use You Only Live Once on its regular schedule as originally planned because of a mixup with their Film Department, which they were sharing it. Fortunately, Bruce Balliet had a program of films to show and no time and place to show them due to the breakdown of the 16mm projectors in the film center, so that slot on the schedule was quickly filled to the satisfaction of just about everyone.

Now it looks like everything has returned to normal for the Committee schedule and we will have to go around asking if the night's movie arrived or not. However, there is an important movie in May, for the print is privately owned and there's some question as to who's going to bring it up to Bard... sol levis siegel

will return next issue. St. Kate is currently recuperating from this one, cruising to the island of Iona on a boulder.

CASINO NIGHT AT BARD

may 11, 1974

8:30 pm

WHITE HORSE

liquor store

74 sum brooklyn o

758-3621

domestic imported liquor & wines

southern broadway

$2 gets you $200 grand (play money)

(look for further ads)
In order to write effectively about a topic, you must know what you're talking about; you must experience it or research it; otherwise you're only writing opinion without any authority. Due to the nature of death, i.e., simply that of dying, the only way to know it is to experience it. Obviously, if you experience it, you can't talk about it.

Jesus Christ breaks through all this with the authority to the reward. Death is all about. Almost 2000 years ago He died, was buried, and rose again, never to die again. He has experienced it and is alive, able to tell us about it.

To start, He tells us why we must die: we're sinners. When God created man and placed him in the Garden of Eden, He subjected him to a sin and to a subject to a simple test of obedience. God tells us we have failed the test; we have sinned against Him, for sin is basically an attitude of wanting to go our way instead of God's way. As a consequence of sin, we must die (Genesis chap. 3, verse 19) for God has said the wages of sin is death (Romans chap. 6, verse 23). The awful nature of man shows itself in different ways: crime hasn't exactly gone out of style, sexual perversion is still with us. The Bible also teaches in Matthew 7:13-14 that there are two roads we must choose between: the broad and the narrow. He warns that, though the narrow way leads to eternal life in heaven, few people will find it. It's a hard way to travel, a life of discipline and being prepared to swim against the current, but the rewards are great. Your decision concerning Jesus Christ will determine your eternal destiny, heaven or hell, after you die. Yes, one round at life is all we get. Hebrews 9:27 states that it is appointed for man to die once and then to judgment. Christ makes it very clear about how you go to heaven—"I am the Way, the Truth, and the Life; no one comes to the Father but by Me (John 14:6)." Jesus does a significant thing here—He doesn't say "I'm going to show you the way," He doesn't say "I'm going to tell you the way," He says "I am the Way." You don't go through Me, you don't go at all.

Jesus is the Way—He took our place on the cross and took the penalty for sin that we deserve (2 Cor. 5:21). He is the Truth—Acts 4:12 says He is the only way we can be saved. Other ways may seem right, but Prov-'erbs warns us not to make a mistake in choosing ways whose ends are eternal death (14:12).

Jesus is the Life—He came to give us life in all its abundance. He came to remove the sin barrier that stood between God and man. His death and resurrection is what Christian stands on. It is what Easter is all about. Ask the fact that you are a sinner and that Jesus took your place on the cross. Ask Him to forgive you of your sins and by faith receive Him as your personal Lord and Savior. Be willing to live your new Christian walk under His Lordship. He'll show you in the book of The Revelation says in the 20th verse of the third chapter that Jesus is standing at the door knocking, patiently waiting for you to answer. Don't put it off—do it now. God warns that the time to repent is limited. "Now is the accepted time...now is the day of salvation (2 Cor. 6:2)."