Now you know how fast rioters move out when a PEPPER FOG® smoke generator moves in. Now, loaded with a new Super-Strength Type CS just developed by G.O.E.C., it’s a non-lethal "street cleaner" of almost unbelievable power. It is a new liquid, CS irritant formulation, most potent ever made — helps you keep control under the toughest conditions of hot temps, cold weather, or wind.

With the temporary tear-producing, burning and "I can’t breathe" sensations it causes, Super-Strength Type CS not only sends the meanest troublemakers running. It convinces them not to come back. It also works in cool temperatures and breezes where milder formulations might lose their punch.

For departments with limited budgets a PEPPER FOG® generator and a good stock of formulations make a formidable tear gas arsenal. It’s extremely controllable; you can trigger anything from a 1-second puff to a 10-minute deluge (on a four-quart filling). It puts out as much gas as dozens of grenades at a fraction the cost; can’t be thrown back; doesn’t start fires. On and inert smoke formulations are available, in addition to the super-strength type CS.

Do you have the Street Cleaner yet? Ask for the full story on G.O.E.C.’s new Super-Strength Type CS and PEPPER FOG® tear smoke generators.

General Ordnance Equipment Corporation, P.O. Box 11211, Freeport Road, Pittsburgh, Pa. 15238. Phone (412) 782-2161.

PEPPER FOG is a registered trademark of General Ordnance Equipment Corporation.
is art out on a limb

I'm writing this in the Bard style (not writing, but life). That is it now the eleventh hour. I've been asked to review the Student Art show currently at Proctor. (Must be something about my old pants and hounds-tooth dust jacket.) The results follow.

What is a complete novice to the fine art of criticizing the fine arts to do? Answer: Simple, just find some handy theories of art criticism that make sense, that permit one to find one's way through the maze of week-ly avant-gardists and apply sound, sensible criteria to the comparison of art works. Unfortunately, my handy home course from the back of the New York Times Magazine (Good art, bad art?) hasn't arrived yet so I will have to do it on my own.

O.K. Number one. The show cannot be judged on the basis of nonartistic content, because as usual there isn't any to any of the works. In this respect, it has always seemed to me that the Arts have gotten themselves out on a beautiful limb, like the old dilemma of the impossibly of a mind contemplating itself. The mind gets so busy contemplating that it leaves itself nothing to contemplate. The problem in painting is, I gather, to put color down on canvas in some interesting (?), artistic (?), val-uable (?) way. If the above criteria existed, the word would be easy to supply, the best one can say is senselessly.

But this seems to me to be a cop out. O.K. The canvas is divided in some way and paint put down between the divisors. One extreme technique is simply to put down one solid color on the entire canvas. Otherwise, when colors go on, they begin to make shapes and thing, and the author of the work must inevitably overcome some way, has to say something with these colors, has to make something happen that reveals him (her) to himself and to others. It is interesting that once upon a time artists (who did not call themselves that) did beautiful, intricate work anonymously, whereas today artists whose personalities are promoted by the sellers of cult-sure (Garret Laming's word) take credit for works that were made by anony-rous forces of nature, like gravity and cement. On the other hand, I'm sure that most contemporary artists would be very offended if their work were described as countless.

Ideally, critics ought to offer young artists protection (yes, even san-ctuary) from the obvious evils of the sale and manufacture of instant mas- ters, trivials, and in-sims. Colleges should be the places where people learn values that permit them to begin the arduous journey of explora-tion of the self and primarily the value of work as the vessel upon which to embark on that exploration.

Unfortunately, I see almost nothing in the show that would indicate that that is happening very much at Bard. (I'm willing to argue.) All the work in the show is derivative to the second degree. None of it reveals to me the presence of a presence or at: the beginning of a personal vision.

...continues page five

interview

DICK CAVETT RAPS

NEW YORK -(CP)- Dick Cavett was moderating a heated debate between I.F. Stone, the crusading political journalist-publisher, and members of the Young Americans for Freedom (YAF) in his audience.

At the same moment, a twisting of the television dial would reveal Johnny Carson shouting with a young starlet about the rise and the decline of the miniskirt and Mary Griffin crown princess Arthur Treacher with a new hair-piece. So goes the five evening a week show of the late night talk shows.

While Carson and Griffin lead in the ratings with a format of light chic chat that won't offend anyone's ears and won't stimulate anyone's mind, Cavett continues to peer into the heads of people who have something more to say than the title of their latest movie.

Within one week, Cavett's show offered Stone, Chicago Seven Defendant Jerry Rubin, tearing a judge's robe to shreds, Washington Post Columnist Nicholas Von Hueneman talking politics, and Jane Fonda bringing an Amer-ican Indian to the show to talk of the repression against Indians and against those in American society who don't fit into the President's "silent" categ-ory.

In a rare exclusive interview with CPS, Cavett, a former writer for Johnny Carson and a veteran of his own daily morning and summer prime-time talk shows, discussed his program and his own views on the state of the society.

CPS: Do you feel the intellectual level of your show will hurt you in the battle for ratings as columnist Earl Wilson has charged?

Cavett: I haven't seen that many things on the show I think would lose anybody. On a night when I'm dull, I should lose the audience.

CPS: Do you watch your own show?

Cavett: Sometimes I do. If there is something extraordinarily good or bad on my show I switch around to see who is doing what when I'm doing what I am.

CPS: Are you attempting to aim your show at a particular audience, say a younger viewer or a more intellectual viewer than Griffin or Carson attract?

Cavett: No, I never try to aim it. I don't know where the audience is. If the show appears to be aimed at a particular group, it's accidental. Are young people watching? I have no way of knowing if they are. There are no Nielsen homes on campuses. I'd be pleased to find that young people are watching the show, but there is no conscious attempt made to use the show as a forum to accomplish social change.

CPS: While a lot of young people respect your show, some are critical of you for not taking more of a per-sonal stand on the issues your guests discuss. Why don't you take a more politically active role on the show? Do you feel it is your job to be objective as a host?

Cavett: I hang back unless I feel my opinion is required. But I've never really decided what a host of a show like this is supposed to do. I don't believe my job is merely to ask questions. Still, I wish the idea of using the show. If there were a candidate I wanted to win, I would have him on. But I'd have a lot of other people on too. I try not to use the show, for there's something morally dubious about it, I might doubt my own wis-dom, I'm not active in politics. I don't go out and campaign. I think politics can be quite boring, though I realize politics in the traditional election sense isn't what people like Jerry Rubin are talking about.

CPS: What did you think of the Chicago Seven Trial?

Cavett: I get the feeling from those I talk to and what I read that what (I.F. Stone) says is right. Judge Julian, Hoffmann gave more than enough rope to hang himself. My suspicion is that the trial was conceived as an ill-advised attempt to stifle dissent. I also think the defendants did blow it a bit. I think the original Tom Hayden approach that Stone talked about of testing the legality of the law would have been a better approach to stick to. I'd be interested in knowing if the defendant ever sat down at some point in the trial and said, "Let's cut loose now."

CPS: Do you disagree with the use of theatrics to demonstrate a point?

Cavett: If theatrics works to make people angry about something and then makes them admit the existence of the problem when they cool off, fine. But I don't think theatrics would work with me. I don't see the statistics to indicate it's effective. Nothing has radicalized me enough to think there is no hope other than these kinds of theatrics. I didn't decide yet that the system is shit.

CPS: What are your thoughts in retro-spect about the censorship of Judy continued on page three
To the Editor:

I can very well see that my days of raping Bard girls are over due to the formation of a women's liberation group on campus. When I was at Bard in 1938, women knew their place - under me. Times are changing, though. Imagine, women protesting against rape!

However, as a Marxist-Leninist Wild Man I acknowledge to suppression of the old by the new. The declining female submission under the wave of female assertion.

Bard college fucks women, however. They fuck women employees with cheap wages relative to men's wages. Therefore Bard is our enemy. "Whatever Bard opposes we should support." (Bastardization of Chairman Mao's saying, Red Book p.15, Peking ed.)

In a dialectical framework Bard College stands in contradiction to women. This contradiction can only be resolved in a struggle which sweeps away Bard College (further adding to the pollution in the Hudson) and results in the superseding of a new order. So this is the Bardian Wild Man saying Right on!

Power to Women's Liberation!

Power to the People!

End Bard College!

Reunlar Justice Brown!

Wild men of the world unite!

--Bardian Wild Man, '36

P.S. The name is Bardian Wild Man, NOT Bard Wild Man. Do not make that mistake again or I will swoop down on the campus and rape and pillage and plunder.

Dear Observer:

--Corfu

To the Editor:

On the second floor of the library, there is a new bulletin board space devoted to an experiment in communications at Bard. It is meant to supplement the existing forms of communication on campus. Contributions should be in the form of letters, either addressed to the Community at large, a specific person, official, department, resident of a specific dorm, etc. It is expected that these letters will fall into several categories, most being requests for information, complaints, and general comments about specific situations on campus. All contributions will be posted. There is no censorship, but there are three rules:

Contributions must be legible (but typewritten on 8½ x 11 paper helps keep the format.)

Contributions must be signed. Name or alias must be provided. It is against the nature of such a medium of expression to have any rules at all, but these rules are necessary to try to keep a little objectivity in the content.

The idea of this experiment is to provide a public forum where it will be convenient for the College Community to inform itself of what the disputes are, what the facts are, and who if any one, is withholding information, thus curtailing the unspoken rules of an academic community to freedom of expression and availability of the facts necessary to form rational opinions. Those indicated in letters of complaint, or requests for information will be contacted and asked to write a note of explanation. Rebuttal or concur-

ring opinions are requested to show the spectrum of thought here at the college where general comments are posted.

All contributions should be marked Bard Bull, Box 395, and deposited in Campus Mail.

Sincerely,
Andrew Fitzpatrick

continued to page 4

I KEEP RUNNING.

\---

BUT THEY KEEP COMING AFTER ME.

\---

I THREW THEM MY HUSBAND HE GOBBLED HIM UP AND THEY WERE CLOSE ON MY HEELS AGAIN.

\---

I THREW THEM MY MIDDLE CHILD HE HAD A TREE AND THEY WERE CLOSE ON MY HEELS AGAIN.

\---

I THREW THEM MY YOUNGEST CHILD, HE JOINED THE PACK AND THEY'RE CLOSE ON MY HEELS AGAIN.

\---

I'M TOO TIRED TO RUN ANYMORE, BUT I HAVE ONE HOPE LEFT.

\---

I'LL BE RESCUED BY THOSE WHO LOVE ME.

\---

This cartoon was published by Andrew Feiffer.
IMAGAWA AT BARD

Professor Kenji Imagawa will visit Bard College March 31 through April 2, 1976. On April 2, 1970 he will be at Vassar College.

Faculty and students of institutions in the Mid-Hudson Valley are invited to meet with Professor Imagawa during his stay and to give a talk at Bard on "Aspects of Japanese Literature" at 8:00 P.M. in Albee Social Room.

Professor Imagawa will discuss contemporary novelists, especially Kawabata and Mishima, and some that are not well known in the United States. He also has lectured on Tanka and Haiku poetry and the relation of Japanese Literature to aspects of Japanese culture.

Born in Sapporo, Hokkaido (the Northern island of Japan), Professor Imagawa graduated from Tokyo Imperial University in the Department of English Literature. He received advanced training at Fordham University in 1952. He has taught at several colleges, was appointed professor at Nagoya University, and is today on leave from his post as Professor at Nanzan University in Nagoya. Last year he was selected by the Fulbright Commission as a senior scholar on Japanese literature and language. He was invited to teach at three colleges in Iowa, and has also travelled and lectured elsewhere. He has written articles on Chaucer and Shakespeare, and is the author of ESSAYS ON ENGLISH AND JAPANESE.

(koblitz speaks)

On Thursday evening, April 2, Robert J. Koblitz, Professor of Government at Bard will be the second lecturer in this semester's Faculty Lecture Series. His topic will be JAPAN: Education and Politics: the Revolt of the Nissi.

Dr. Koblitz, who has a B.A. and Ph. D. from Harvard, and who has served as a Japanese Language and Area Specialist with the A.U.S., was last year a Fulbright Visiting Professor at Nanzan University in Nagoya, Japan. In 1955-56 he spent a year as Fulbright Visiting Professor at the University of Baroda, India, and in 1957 he was Director of the Foreign Students Orientation Program.

Area residents are invited to attend the lecture, at 8:00 p.m. in Procter Art Center.

"Dear Dr. Hip Pocrates:
I have been told that an individual's hair on his head only grows so long naturally that he has to cut it in the very end and shed some of it or burn the ends and it will grow somewhat longer. Is this true?"

ANSWER: Hair is dead matter except for the root in the hair follicle beneath the skin. Curing or burning the ends won't change its rate of growth.

Human intestinal enzymes cannot digest hair. A chronic hair swallowing habit often results in the formation in the stomach of hairballs or trichobezoars. Hairballs which are found most in the stomachs of mentally retarded or mentally disturbed children, can cause intestinal obstruction if they pass on to the small bowel.

"Dear Dr. Schoenfeld:
I am an 18 year old male and have a lot of gray hair. I've had gray hair since I was 13 or so and, while it doesn't bother me, I am very curious about it. I've heard that worry causes gray hair. Could this be so?"

ANSWER: Gray hair occurring early in life is usually due to hereditary factors, though emotional strain can accelerate the process. Graying and whitening of hair is due to loss of function or death of pigment cells in the hair follicles.

Worrying about gray hair will cause more gray hair.

"Dear Doctor:
'Turkish girls make good wives because they are passive and considerate. They are physically attractive because they shave the public area daily. Are there any matrimonial agencies in Turkey that contact girls regarding possible marriage to American men?"

ANSWER: I'm sure you could find many Turkish men who could, if they would, tell you their wives are not passive. In fact, a "considerate" woman would certainly not be passive. The Turkish embassy in Washington might have information about means of meeting Turkish women.

Middle-Eastern women commonly shave their pubic hair but the original reason is lost in antiquity. Perhaps the custom began in order to prevent infection by crab lice or pro-Kweti-Cuprex lesions. Lesions of venereal disease would also have been easier to detect on a shaven pubis, an important consideration in times when syphillis epidemics decimated whole populations.

The physiologic reason for public hair is unknown. Author G. Legman believes it survives from the time man's ancestors walked on all fours. He also believes shaving pubic hair involves a kind of castration.

Legman quotes the following story in his RATIONALE OF THE DIRTY JOKE (Grove Press) in an analysis of sexual humor patterned after Freud's WIT AND THE UNCONSCIOUS:

A man in a whore-house asks for a virgin, but complains that the girl given him cannot be a virgin, all the hair has been shaved off her pubis. "She haven't any soul," he says.

Madam, "Wolf? What do you want to do, fuck or kiss?

"Dear Dr. Hip Pocrates:
I certainly hope Judge Carawil does not get to the Supreme Court. It's an insult to the South, because the guy is so meddlesome and such a clown. I doubt he'll be stopped, though, because Haynesworth was stopped.

ANSWER: Do you feel your program has a news broadcast acting function?
Cavett: It has a news function, but that can be part of entertainment.
Koblitz: I like to say that I'm in the news business, but I feel the show's primary purpose is entertainment.

ANSWER: Has ABC threatened to remove your show if it doesn't get a certain percentage of the ratings?
Cavett: We're guaranteed a year — through '70 almost, so I'm not particularly worried at the moment.

ANSWER: Are you planning to have more rock groups on your show?
Cavett: I thought maybe rock was fading. Really, I like having them on. And there will be more.

ANSWER: Are you trying to phase the monologue out of your show? They seem to be getting shorter.
Cavett: I'm just doing a shorter monologue. It's hard to get a good eight joke monologue.

ANSWER: Is it easier to write or to perform?
Cavett: It's easier to perform than to write. But it's easier to write for other people than for yourself.

"Dear Dr. Hip Pocrates:
I think politically. I found Richard Harris' book on the Justice Depart-
ment — "Justice" — totally convin-
ing. The Justice Department has be-
come a political arm under Mitchell, and that's just what Ramsey Clark, the
former Attorney General, feared.

Copyright, 1979 by Eugene Schoenfeld, M.D.
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CAT OF TAILS

Last week I wrote this column about two campus groups that were apparently, despite all odds, trying to do something to improve the situation here at Bard. Perhaps I was a bit limited in my outlook, for it would seem now, that these two groups did not represent the sum-of-change at Bard.

Rather, they seem to be indicative of a trend that seems to be taking place. Not a minor detail in saying that Bard is, at best a difficult place to judge, and to generalize about it, especially when one is attempting to deal with such an obviously touchy subject as change.

Perhaps it is just a sensation that I alone have felt, but it appears to me that there is a definite switch towards innovation that was previously lacking here at Bard. Whether this is solely the result of last semester’s strike, I do not know, but ...some correlation is undoubtedly there. Whether this fact, that change is now being implemented, sufficiently justifies last semester’s strike, I do not know either. I would not be inclined to say that change is completely good or bad at Bard, although I do feel that it is absolutely necessary to continue here, and function in any kind of meaningful manner. I am saying, essentially, that some change is good, others bad. That is, and I completely admit it, an extraordinarily Imonstous outlook.

But, to return to the first premise, that change is becoming an important feature of the Bard community. This is an important concept, taking the past into account, up to last semester’s strike. But a stagnant school Activism of any sort seemed to be limited to drinking or smoking dope. The average Bard student was possessed by a state that transcended apathy and bordered on the absurd. This is, essentially, the type of image that would impress upon a Quinlan the need to bust Bard. Nothing angers the middle class so much as to be confronted with their own concept of media-ocracy. To a Quinlan, who functions as a champion for these values, a place such as Bard was, tank of all that threatened him period. And, so, the bust.

In the same respect, this type of image is what frustrated the faculty more than anything else. A teacher, like anyone else, has to find satisfactions in his work. This is extremely difficult for a teacher, understandably, simply because his work is constantly parodied before him, embodied in the students he teaches. He can, on the one hand, ignore them, in which case he is basically ignoring himself, or he can try to work with them, which will most likely be as frustrating in the end.

So, we have this situation, before the strike, where everybody really hated, and was frustrated by the students at Bard. There were little more to education in the U.S. then faculty and polices, so in allaying the frustration, Bard students were in reality, negating themselves.

Now, we have an almost complete reversal. Certainly the police still hate US, but for the first time people are talking seriously of trying to find a method of business that might work. It can be done, and I would imagine that Quinlan will be in for a time awakening this spring. Because the students themselves, are now awakened, people are doing things and enjoying it, and Bard is changing because of that.

But what is truly important about all this is that Bard is no longer a stagnant school. Like the ice on the Hudson, Bard is breaking up and becoming a free flowing school again. This is as absolute necessary thing if Bard is to exist. It must remain able to change, without some- thing as shattering as a strike taking place. The channels, for ideas and innovation to take place, have to be left open. If not, then, the stude- nts, will pile up the process a little.

John Kerzenbach

LETTERS

To the Editor:

Please put the following announcement in your school newspaper:

Women’s Weekend: A conference about Women’s Liberation, Films, workshops, guerrilla theatre.

Regina Frye, April 10th at 7:00 P.M through Saturday, April 11th at Anthony Lounge, 34th Street at Rochester, Rochester, N.Y.

Registration fee is 92.00 for intellectual suicide, and we’ll have no one, but ourselves, to blame.

John Kerzenbach

FOOD CO-OP

A Natural Foods Co-op Store is opening this week (probably Friday) in the basement trunk room of South Hoffman. It will be carrying cereals (Families, Granola, etc.), nuts, dried fruits, yogurt, cheese, organic honey, natural peanut butter, freshly baked bread, fruit juices, and many other good foods. Anything it doesn’t have, it will try to get for you.

Prices will be as low as possible, and all members of the Co-op will get an additional 20% discount on every- thing they buy. The membership fee is $2.00 for the semester.

Why Won’t You Join?

From page six

Girls really are pretty damn funny, but they’ll never convince anyone that what they are doing is anything anyone is trying for growing up.

When you meet with a group of girls, you find that they have such good ideas, and are so good too, that you have to have meetings, because everyone in the group would already know exactly what each other member thinks on any given issues - specific or general.

I heard a girl say that she had been thinking of joining a woman’s liberation group, and that she did, because she “doesn’t want to become a member of a group that [some girl she disliked] is in.” As I have already pointed out, you are a member of something, because of certain properties which you share with the other members. But these are far more properties which you do not share with the others, and this does not make the thing you have in common any less important to the group. Surely you are intelligent enough to maintain a non-polarized, slightly Discount belief system. If like A, I don’t like B. A likes B. You can handle that, can’t you?

6. You agree with the basic tenets of women’s liberation, but there are other things in your life that are more important, necessary, satisfying, or constructive that you could be doing.

You are only one person; there are only twenty-four hours in a day.

The first thing I can answer is inadequate. But, I’ll say it maybe you don’t realize just how necessary, important, constructive, and satisfying women’s liberation can be. But you won’t know unless you try it.

This is the hardest objection of all to deal with. I know a girl whose parents won’t let her play the tuba because it’s not “feminine.” My reply point is that there could be some things that are more necessary, important, satisfying, or constructive that you can’t do — or that you won’t do — because you are a woman.

Right now I have a senior project that badly needs to be worked on, and yet, I’m required to write an article. But if I were living 200 years ago, I probably wouldn’t be able to write a senior project, because, as a woman, I wouldn’t be in college. And I wonder what things I am expected to do that might be able to do 200 years from now — and maybe we should speed up the process a little.

—Paula Lockard

About the new food coop

Carpenter selected

Rob Carpenter, a senior at Bard, has been selected as one of 400 college students from institutions across the nation for the Washington Summer Internship Program. The students, nominated for their political and public service work, must have completed at least 60 semester hours, and have a grade point average of 3.5 or better.

As interns, they will be employed by various Federal agencies, at salaries commensurate with their qualifications, and will be doing meaningful work related to the agencies’ missions. They will also participate in specially arranged seminars which will meet intermittently during the period of their employment. These seminars will look closely at Federal programs relating to domestic or international affairs. In addition, a small group seminars, will there be private sessions on topics that should be of interest to all interns.

The Program will provide an opportunity to present some of the problem and issues facing Government to the Nation’s finest young leaders and will also give the participants a look at Government in operation.

Mr. Carpenter, who has majored in Bard in physics and math, has been selected as an intern by the Atomic Energy Commission.

AMERICAN INQUIRY

CARPETER SELECTED

by Bonnie Marus and Laurie Gilbert

Last Saturday March 28 women concerned for their rights and male sympathizers marched against New York State abortion laws and for free and legal abortions on demand. The march began at Bellevue Hospital and went up 34th Street across to Broadway then down to Union Square where there was a rally.

The spirit of the march was one of unity, pride and indignation. Why don’t women have the right to control their own bodies? And why is it that the people in the government who are supposed to control these matters are not women? A great variety of women’s liberation groups marched uniting all women to one common goal. A number of Bard women attended the march. The chants saw voice to a growing militancy and determination.

“Free our sisters, free ourselves. Free abortions on demand.”

“Out of houses, out of the jails (standing out from under. Women Unite)"

“Hey, Hey, A.M.A., How many war- en did you kill today?”

“Free abortions on demand, sisterhood is powerful.”

“Male chauvinists, you better stand up or you’ll be taking Mary’s bacon.”

An impressive o’ them all was a mass Indian war whoop which traveled the whole length of the march, which was seven blocks long.

There were some incidents of violence but on the whole the march was peaceful. One was invited for the first demonstration in a long time and it did not wear violent forms. It is because they don’t feel threatened by women’s militancy, Yet.

IS THIS LITERUS THE PROPERTY OF NEW YORK STATE?

by Bonnie Marus and Laurie Gilbert
Maybe this is too much to ask and I'm simply being naïve about the difficulty of learning the craft of art. But I insist that the reviewers would not be pleased if I just praised the craft in their work. (I'll do it anyway)

Tom Mount's work is very pleasing in its clarity and the purity of its colors, and Alan Parson's sculpture is handsome in its well put-togetherness, but both seem to me to be made on the basis of contemporary formulas. On the other hand, work that is both formulaic and not well made is just plain ugly, and there is some of that in the show too. I'm thinking of a work that was so poorly matted that the print was drooping out of its frame towards the floor, obeying that same law of gravity that accounted for most of the way that the paint was put on the canvas. Too much. I like the size and dynamism of Jim Perry's piece, but it seems to lack clarity and purpose. I did not feel in looking at it that every busy and convoluted was chosen deliberately by him. Hetty Glick's canvas (7) is interesting but symptomatic of the dilemma of modern art. The rectangular canvas is not enough (and why should it be, it is after all a historical accident itself) so the artist builds out of it, springs it loose with pillows, chords and rags. Newer, the problem of creating a painting thereby still remains unsolved.

My own feeling is that each work of art should reveal and create a world that draws the viewer into it almost as if by some magic tunneling effect or magnetism (I had mixed metaphors for breakfast) so that it would be almost impossible to walk past the work without feeling its pull. I cannot honestly say that this happened to me with many of the works in this show. Only Ken Daly's large canvas had this effect for me. Perhaps I did not bring the proper vision to the viewing. I understand the confrontation between art and viewer as dialogue, and I'd be happy to continue talking.
6

Bad Women Liberation presents the fourth in a series of weekly viewpoints

Due to an editing foul up last week, the Womans Liberation article was misleading and inaccurate in its final form. By the end of the semester, hopefully a cross-section of views will have been represented.

This is directed to all of you women who believe that the situation of women in our society definitely leaves something to be desired, but do not have a group or project. You agree with some of the views of the ideas presented, but the group has not been formed, and the Observer regrets the entire article this week.

Each column of the work of a different individual, who is a part of woman's liberation, but in no way represents the entire group. By the end of the semester, hopefully a cross-section of views will have been represented.

1. You don't want to be liberated.
You think that it is great that women are working to get to where they want to be -- more power to them, more freedom. You have to get married, have a household of kids, be a housewife and probably be pretty and "feminine," etc. You like when men carry the things for you, open doors, call you up on the phone, and walk with you at night, so you feel safe.
My reaction to this is not a simple, all-inclusive "bullsh*t," because I think you are being logical. I think that every person should be able to do with themselves what they want to do, when they want to do it.
I repeat, everyone. I do pride to do what they want to do, when they want to do it. I don't mind if you get married, and you decide to go to law school. You should be able to work this out with a few problems, and be able to get married man would have, right? There should be facilities for your husband's day-care, your husband should be able to work with the housework, care of children, etc., when you are both employed. If you are a wife and mother, decide to, or have to go to work, you should be able to have the same opportunities. But then you are like the lady in the laundry detergent advertisement, you do the laundry, just because you are the wife. Should be resent if you are a lawyer and a few notches higher than he on the status or pay scale? And as a law student, and a lawyer, then you should want people telling you that the place of wives (all wives) is in the home, and thinking women would not make good lawyers (which would reduce your practice).
To be even more mundane, if you decide to go out for a walk, it's nice that you have big breasts to protect you, but wouldn't it be pleas-

sant to know that you were well-acquainted with the skills of self-defense? But you could actually protect yourself as well or better than any man could defend you.

The point is this. There are usually going to be more options open to you than there are things you will do, but this isn't always the case with women. So if the thing you decide to do happen to be the one that is really fully open to you, this shouldn't make you feel satisfied. Just because you decide to change. In the words of the ad for the New York Times, "Even if you don't read all of it, it's nice to know it's all there?"

2. Another reason some of you women give for not involving yourselves in women's liberation is that you already are liberated. You think that women's liberation is great, and even necessary for women who need it, but you are perfectly free to be happy right where you are. You have picked out your own partner, you got married, and you're happy. You think this is the career you have picked out for yourself; you'll get married and when you decide to, the same goes for having children; the same goes for having relations where you all know about birth control, and even the women who are going to have an abortion, it's just as if you are the exception to the rule. You are going to have an abortion, you are the exception to the rule that women are going to have abortions.

3. You don't like to join groups of any kind. You are not going to be a member of anything. You are an individual. You believe that every human being is an individual, and should be respected as such. Out of this comes women. But no group can represent you, and you represent no group.

Try this: Ask yourself the question, "Who am I?" and give ten answers. You might have replied with such answers as "a college student," "a woman," "an American," and so on. And most of your answers probably placed you in a category with other individuals who share the defining quality of that category with you. In other words, you are already in groups.

The group we are concerned with here is women.' This category is culturally defined in various ways. When you meet with other women for the purpose of liberation, you are scanning this cultural definition. You are trying to broaden it so that saying that you are a woman is all that you are, you are getting more possibilities than it presently does. In this case, being a woman in the group will let you know more of an individual, not less of one.

4. You don't like separation between men and women. In (this) society, if you are a woman, you are alienated from enough already from men, and if they are not truly liberated, they have to open themselves to communication and understanding with men. Separation therefore of ourselves as a group would be, to your thinking, a grave mistake. Boundaries should be lowered, not put up.
As I just said, the group 'women' is there for you. We want to lower the boundaries, or get out of the 'jar.' We have to change the definition of the contents of the jar. As it stands now, women are people who are defined in a relationship to men, and by their biological function of having children. And by definition they are willing to change this definition to one that will reflect back to the woman. You think of 'man' does, for the most part. And so, you have to redefine the jar to something that can come out and meet other individuals as equals, then this is what it will happen. Men are going to be long separated from human beings (as we are now).

5. You agree with the ideas of women's liberation, but there are certain women in these groups that really mean to you, so you don't participate in women's liberation groups. These are the ones who take everything a woman says or does as a clear cut case of male chauvinism. Or else they are the ones who take nothing, personal, neurotic hostility toward men, and use women's liberation as a rationalization. Or maybe they are lesbians. Or maybe they're just stupid and present with illogical arguments that don't hold up (and yet they won't stop talking about women and liberation). Or they have a million reasons, or the other one, or the other one, "for fun." These are the girls who enjoy the fact of liberation, but who themselves being more vulgar then construc-

tion workers, jock each other on the as in front of a crowd of men to get their reaction, and treat "funky" men every chance they get. Often these
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The Supreme Court Appellate division decided that since Murtaugh's crime occurred in the borough of Manhattan, they could not rule on the case.

Under normal circumstances the District Attorney of Manhattan would immediately press charges. In this case Manhattan D.A. Frank Hogan, well known for his old back room associations with Tammany Hall, was the political boss who maneuvered for Murtaugh's defense in Brooklyn. Knowing this it is not difficult to understand why Murtaugh was not prosecuted in Manhattan by Hogan. Hogan realized the political consequence if he brought Murtaugh to trial. Adding salt on the public's wounds Hogan apparently proceeded to reward Murtaugh's silence by making him Chief Magistrate Judge of Manhattan.

If Murtaugh wasn't indebted to Hogan for not prosecuting him for his crimes against the citizenry of New York City, he certainly became indebted to Hogan for his newly acquired, safe, secure, well paying job as Magistrate Judge. Thus, an honorable position went to a most dishonest, undeserving individual. Murtaugh obviously became Hogan's personal judge and it came as no surprise when Hogan appointed Murtaugh to the Panther 21 trial in New York City. This is why striking Columbia students last spring demanded the immediate release of the Panthers by their trustee Frank Hogan.

The Panthers, struggling valiantly, tried to remove Murtaugh as the presiding judge specifically for the reason that Hogan 'suggested' Murtaugh for the case. But the Panthers came up against the same Appellate Supreme Court in Brooklyn which acquitted Murtaugh for his criminal activity. It came as no surprise that this court denied the Panther's motion for a new judge stating that 'Judge Murtaugh is a fair judge in court.' I'd like to know just how 'fair' he is when he grants all motions by the prosecution and denies all motions by the defense, most of the time giving no reason. I'd like to know just how 'fair' this judge is when he tells the defendants, 'Black men have no rights that a white man is bound to respect.'

---

Michael Harvey

---

Allen Ginsberg Dec. 16, 1969