alley

We agree with Mary Crowe that parietals should not be the issue to spark a movement to increase liberalism in this college. We feel, however, that all of judicial has completely misinterpreted the original statement.

We signed a petition admitting that we had either explicitly or complicitly broken the parietal rules, and hoped that ~~our~~ action resulting from this admission would lead to a more honest and representative student government. We hoped, too, that this would lead to some suggestions on how to make our education more honest, more consistent with Bennington's reputation as a liberal-minded institution. However, we are puzzled and angered by the way the Judicial Committee felt free to formulate a student petition into their own terms; to make what was a remarkable show of student committment into an extremely foolish and tactless power play. Had we been read Judicial's particular formulation at the meeting, before voting, we would have voted no. Suspens on of curriculum was discussed at the meeting, but to project an abolishment of curriculum simply is not the province of the Judicial Committee. Student EPC is the most sensible and effective channel for expressing such suggestions. Surely there were EPC representatives at that meeting - why weren't they reminded and organized? Most depressing of all, the wonderful suggestions made at the meeting have been ridiculously simplified in Judicial's preliminary remarks. To insist on cessation of rules and curriculum for next fall, on the basis of a petition signed to clarify the parietal issue, is sheer irresponsibility; it invites similar illogic in the administration's treatment of the petition. The people who originated the petition showed a lot more sense in their method than the Judicial Committee has.

We really want most of the changes proposed at the Judicial meeting to have a good chance of being implemented. They should have been responsibly formulated by the student organization most empowered to do so. Judicial should have kept its place as an advisory and disciplinary body.

We continue to support the explicit statement of the original petition. We refuse to support Judicial's misleading formulation of our motives and solipsistic interpretation of our goals.

Carole McGuirk

Janie Paul