Architectural Dean Appointed

By Bill Jackson

Professor of Architecture William J. Mitchell of Harvard University and the past dean of the School of Architecture and Planning, has accepted the position of MIT’s architectural dean, currently director of Harvard’s Master in Design Studies Program, will take over July 1, it was announced Monday by Dr. Moses.

The selection follows a lengthy international search. Dr. Menuchin had originally planned to step down in January, but agreed to stay on until a faculty advisory committee could find a suitable replacement.

Professor Mark S. Wrightman, in announcing the appointment, said that the committee had looked for a "careful assessment not only of the candidate’s qualifications, but of the needs and desires of the faculty and students in the School.

Mitchell is the author of several books, some of which have already been published by the MIT Press. "MIT is a place where the faculty and students in the School are deeply rooted and where one can have an immediate, very personal impact on MIT and on the physics

Bras New Course I Head

By Bill Jackson

Seven Engineering and Architecture professors have been appointed to classroom and research laboratories as the result of a major gift from Charles M. Vest, a former director of MIT’s Research Laboratory for Electronics and a founder of the School of Engineering.

Professor Bras, who works on the interactions of small, macroscopic structures, has been promoted to assistant professor at the University of Michigan. He has published two books and 67 articles in the area of his research focus on two symposia proceedings. "It is a place where the faculty and students in the School are deeply rooted and where one can have an immediate, very personal impact on MIT and on the physics

Rain Falls to Stop Commencement

By Reuven M. Lerner

Heavy rains notwithstandng, MIT’s 126th Commencement took place on June 1, with the institution awarding 3,944 degrees to 1,795 graduates. It was the first time in 13 years that Commencement was moved indoors, rather than in Killeen Field.

This year’s Commencement speaker, Rep. Les Aspin (D-Wis), told graduates that they were "graduating into a new era, one in which the nuclear threat has receded but the dangers have not diminished. In that light, Aspen, who chairs the House Armed Services Committee, said that the United States should consider a ban on nuclear testing.

"There is no compelling reason to do it any other way," he said. "We’ve been working without an effective nuclear program for the past 13 years, earlier, told graduates that Commencement "celebrates your accomplishments during your student years."

In addition to praising the Classes of 1942 and 1965 for reaching their respective 50th and 25th anniversaries, Vest told the graduates the importance of tolerance and democracy. "Many of the people who were here 50 years ago were students in the United States," said Professor of Physics Jerrold M. Friedman. "It is a place where the faculty and students in the School are deeply rooted and where one can have an immediate, very personal impact on MIT and on the physics..."
Jesse Jackson Renewes Assault on 'Distant' Clinton

Jesse Jackson renewed his biting assault on Bill Clinton Tuesday, accusing the Democratic presidential candidate of attacking him on the Sisther Saudjah questions 10 days ago as part of "political calculation."

The rebuff was stiff enough to be a warning to Clinton that he may face growing political pressure to act a little quicker than in the less than three weeks before the party's national convention in New York. 

One of Clinton's key credentials, featured at a meeting Tuesday evening of the U.S. Conference of Mayors, Jackson postulated, involves endorsing the Arkansas governor and accusing him of following "a policy of distancing" himself from Jackson and the other Coalition and other Democratic constituencies to seek the votes of conservative blacks.

The civil right leader also raised once again the question of Clinton's having played golf at all-white country club in Little Rock. Referring dutifully to Clinton's claim that he had been angered by Sister Saudjah's remarks about blacks killing white people, Jackson told a press conference: "When Bill Clinton left the all-white country club, he didn't say he left because of moral outrage. He just said he'd leave because of the attack which came as something of a surprise."

In his speech to the conference seeking support for his own "Rebuild America" plan, he called Clinton's economic blueprint a step "in the right direction" that "shows an authentic concern for the urban crisis and the need to renovate."

Byron said he had received a late-night telephone call from Maynard Jackson, one of the nation's most influential black politicians, who had agreed to respond to a "non-comment" which was the object of the controversy with Clinton. Maynard Jackson had followed that conference and Monday, and he told the civil rights leader that it was an "awesome moment."

"If so, a call to the president could wipe out a veto of confidence in the Knesset. But he will undoubtedly be a majority Safari of Jewish parliament in parliament by eminence. "Let me tell you, my friend, probably from the right to his side."

A televised exit poll gave Labor 47 seats, with 13 going to Menac, Labor's bitter coalition partner, and 4 to the two minor pro-Arab parties representing Arab citizens of Israel — all told, 67-seat blocking majority.

ANC Breaks Off Negotiations
In Wake of Recent Violence

By Scott Kell

The African National Congress formally broke off constitutional negotiations with the government Tuesday and vowed not to return to the table until the current government has turned a corner and the ANC's demands are met.

The decision by South Africa's leading black political force, approved without dissent by its 90-member national executive committee, inflamed the president's officials and Labour Party leaders in the white-minority government met 12 other parties Tuesday to set up an international commission of inquiry into the massacre last week of 39 blacks in the Inkatha-controlled KwaZulu homelands.

It also marked the first full collapse of contact between the government and the ANC since Nelson Mandela's release from prison more than two years ago. And it opened a dangerous and uncertain new road for a country already racked by bloodshed, deepening black poverty and widespread distrust of the white-controlled political forces.

"We cannot tolerate a situation where the regime's control of state power allows it to deny and cover up violence and terror in the name of anti-terrorism," ANC Secretary-General Cyril Ramaphosa, reading the executive committee's statement.

ANC officials called on the Klerk to set up an international commission of inquiry into the massacre last week of 39 blacks in the Boipatong township, the most serious police attack on the urban black community since 1976 that has left 8,000 black dead since De Klerk launched his reform program.

Ramaphosa said the government "cannot escape responsibility" for the Boipatong massacre, which the ANC contends was carried out by black supporters of the Inkatha Freedom Party with the aid of the police.

President de Klerk said the ANC's decision to halt talks was "based on a fundamental untruth": that the violence and force its self-governing black homelands to end political repression.

Among the stronger demands made by the ANC, was not raised as a suggestion in the KwaZulu massacre while conducting a covert operation, suspending and prosecuting all police involved in township violence."

The National Assembly formally adopted a resolution by a vote of 213 to 90 that would require the president to set up an international commission of inquiry into the massacre last week of 39 blacks in the Inkatha-controlled KwaZulu homelands. Among those demands are that the government carry out its year-old negotiations with all parties while conducting a covert operation, suspending and prosecuting.

The ANC said it would resume negotiations only if de Klerk's white-minority government met 12 demands, which Mandela said he would lay before the U.N. Security Council for a foreign settlement program at the expense of the ANC and the country's black majority.

ANC: "We have not reneged on the peace talks."

ANC leader Nelson Mandela said the ANC had suspended all talks with the government Tuesday pending Tuesday's closed Sunday pending Tuesday's closed Sunday. Among the stronger demands the ANC specified was that the South African team in the Los Angeles Olympics next month in Barcelona will be the first in the Games in 32 years.
By Guy Gugliotta
WASHINGTOm

Members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee have smirked at an unusual agreement to hold closed-door hearings Wednesday on Reagan allegations that the Reagan campaign in 1980 compiled a list of Americans held hostage in the U.S. Embassy in Tehran.

The committee has subpoenaed 16 witnesses, among them former national security advisers Richard V. Allen, Alton Frye, Robert C. McFarlane, former secretary of state Alexander M. Haig Jr. and U.S. Ambassador to South Korea Donald Gregg, who served as national security adviser to Vice President George Bush from 1981-84.

The committee last October authorized its subcommittee on the Western and South Asian affairs to conduct an investigation, but the Senate failed to fund the probe.

Subcommittee Chairman Terry Sanford, D-N.C., and ranking minority member Sen. James M. Jeffords, R-Vt., nonetheless decided to proceed using available committee funds, and apparently developed the idea of closed-door hearings, Murkowski said. Neither Sanford nor Jeffords returned to telephone inquiries.

Under a "procedural agreement" reached early Tuesday, the only four senators will question witnesses in a "secure" room on the fourth floor of the U.S. Capitol. They were Sanford, Jeffords, Foreign Relations Committee Chairman Sen. Albert Krieger, D-Wis., and Sen. James Fox, head of the FBI's New York office, said that John Gotti Sr., Gotti's son, had organized the protest with "special invitations" to members of the Senate where they "campaigned" to delay the hostage-release deadline.
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Keyser's Response
Sought on Harassment

The Tech received a copy of this letter addressed to Associate Provost for Institute Life Samuel J. Keyser.

Provost Keyser, you have not answered my email regarding the "reasonable person" standard in the MIT harassment policy. You have had three weeks to do so. Ombudsmen Mary Rowe and assistant equal opportunity officer Clarene Williams also received the same question and have elected not to answer. Professor Rowe has directed me to you as the authority on the harassment policy, so I assume reasonable for me to expect a reply from you. Do you need another copy of the email? I sent it:

"I have one factual question to ask. MIT's harassment policies make use of a "reasonable person" standard. I am not exactly sure what this means."

What happens to the "reasonable person" standard if two reasonable people disagree? It happens all the time. That's why society can't be run by consensus. Does a behavior have to be such that it would offend any reasonable person, a majority, or just one of several million in the appropriate category?

Also, how will MIT judge what a "reasonable person" thinks? Obviously, it is an arbitrary decision, but does the administration have any guidelines about how to make the determination? Has any thinking been done about how to make this determination?

Surely the Institute has some idea of how it will enforce its own policies. If you have received a copy, and have chosen not to answer, please inform me of your decision so that I can draw the logical conclusions. (I would be happy to discuss this question face to face but would appreciate a written answer on this subject for the benefit of the community.)

Lars Binder G

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

Dangerous Situation in Eastgate Playground

I am writing in regard to a dangerous situation which MIT created in the playground next to Eastgate.

On May 18th, workers were dismantling a wooden fence enclosing the playground. When I passed by at 6:00 am, I saw that they had left the pieces of wood lying around with numerous nails projecting from them. At 10:30 the next morning all of the debris had been removed.

The safety concern should be apparent. I trust that the Institute will take care in future projects, especially those near children's play areas.

Andrew M. Greene '91
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Commencement 1992

Photos by Vipul Bhushan and Ben Wen

Alleen W. Lee, '92, senior class president, and President Charles M. Vest smile and shake hands for their audience during her presentation of the Senior class gift (left).

Terence C. Yates, PhD '92 receives his degree from Dean of Science Robert J. Birgeneau in Kresge Auditorium, where many of the advanced degrees were awarded (below).

Rep. Les Aspin, PhD '66 (D-Wis.) drives home a point in his graduation address (above-left), where he spoke about the role of nuclear arms in American foreign policy and its changing role in a new world. Outgoing Graduate Student Council President Furio Claeys, PhD '92 delivers his salute to advanced degree recipients (above). On a lighter note, away from the pomp and circumstance, a graduate gets a kiss (below-left), two others hug for the camera (below-right), and Varisara Gerjarusak, SM '92 cracks a shy smile (below).
women as well as male, immigrant as well as native, follower as well as leader. We are far from that goal. Indeed, we seem to be in the midst of what Arthur Schlesinger calls the "thinning of America." You must help us to stem the centrifugal forces that would pull us apart. We need tolerance, not divisiveness; mutual respect, not disdain; love, not hate; civility, not re
d
er; hard work, not empty rhetoric; excellence, not mediocrity; good change, not just
tech.

And it must begin by each of us answering "Yes!" to that self-conscious but infinitely articulate voice that called out to us from Los Angeles saying: "People, can't we all just get along?" Because we can "just get along." That can be the starting point to make us more than the sum of our parts. Just as Elizabethan England flowered by melding the tongues and cultures of the inhabitants of the British Isles and their Norman invaders to create the language and imagery of Shakespeare; just as the English, the Irish, the Italians and the Germans came together in New England to create the America that Walt Whitman heard singing; so too we must again come together with diverse races and cul
tures and with common goals, values, and aspirations.

One hundred years ago, at the 1922 commencement, MIT awarded a degree in our first African-American graduate, Robert Rohmer Taylor. He went on to become a distin
guished architect who designed, among other things, most of the build
gs at Tuskegee Institute. And MIT has gone on to become a university of the world, one that continually strives to meet most important needs of society while pushing out the envelope of human knowledge and understanding.

MIT was founded on the belief that a new kind of educational institu
tion was needed- one that would be engaged, passionately and practically, in human affairs, one that was designed to further the welfare of a rapidly growing and changing society. And I would ask that we take this centennial occasion to recommis
tion to those founding principles by working to better reflect the changing face of America among our students, faculty and staff, and in the work that we do.

And I would ask you-on the occasion of your graduation-to help us build a nation and a world community that embraces and values different cul
tures and heritage... that respects the indigenous cultures and heritage... that values the intellectual heritage of all. Because if we can 'just get along,' that is what will happen. Excellence, not mediocrity; love, not hate; civility, not
dain; love, not hate; civility, not
dain; love, not hate; civility, not
dain; love, not hate; civility, not
dain; love, not hate; civility, not

Vest: from Page 8

Congress Votes to Deny Funding for Supercollider Research

Supercollider, from Page 1

Bosna continued: "I believe there are 3 frontiers of research: 1) trying to understand the origin of the uni
ev, and 3) trying to understand the ultimate structure of matter. If the United States devotes not to support the United States is deciding not to support one of the frontiers of research and the country will be worse off." Scientists hope that the Senate, which is expected to consider the SCC
issue after its July recess, would restore funding. The vote is expected to he

Morti Hall at Walker Memorial is closed this summer for remodeling beginning Monday, June 8, 1992. We invite you to enjoy the alternative service provided on the side balcony of Walker Memorial.

Enjoy an outdoor dining retreat! It's like a 1 hour mini-vacation!

Our menu features LEESL SEA FOODS CHOWDER

Open 8 am-1:30 pm, Monday through Friday
Side Balcony of Walker Memorial

RESEARCH POSITIONS

Technicians and Researchers Required

PROGENICS PHARMACEUTICALS, INC. is a biotechnology company specializing in research and development in the areas of infectious diseases and immunology. PROGENICS is located in Tarrytown, N.Y., a Westchester county Long Island community accessible to the New York City area. We are recruiting highly motivated individuals for laboratory positions as technicians and research associates. Research experience in molecular biology, protein chemistry, or cell biology preferred. Excellent salaries and benefits are offered.

Send CV to: Personnel Director PROGENICS P.O. Box 549 Tarrytown, N.Y. 10591.
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BATMAN RETURNS
Directed by Tim Burton.
Written by Daniel Waters.
Starring Michael Keaton, Michelle Pfeiffer and Danny DeVito.
Now playing at Loews Cheri.

By Bill Jackson

YOU MAY HAVE HEARD THAT there's a new Batman movie out. There's been a bit of media coverage.

Despite the over-hype, Batman Returns is an outstanding movie, everything you hoped

A lot happens in this Batman Returns — almost too much. Director Tim Burton and screenwriter Daniel Waters seem to be trying to make up for the slack pace of the first film. In geek terms, this means that if you took Batman and Batman Returns, added up the amount of action in them, and divided by two, each film would have a decent amount of action.

The most exciting part of the film is the addition of humor. Besides the already mentioned Penguin, Michael Keaton is given some opportunity to display his comic talents (and that's how he became a star in the first place, remember?) I won't give away any more of the film's lines, but he has some very funny moments, including a jab at a scene from the first Batman.

Making today, credit also goes to his production team, especially production designer Bo Welch, who designed the amazing sets. Many of his sets are enormous parodies of actual places, including a monstrous and perverse version of New York's Rockefeller Plaza. The set itself is an elaborate visual joke.

That's what makes this film better than the first. Burton and his gang seemed afraid to have fun with the first one, as if they were scared to do something as frivolous as have fun when making a movie with a bazillion-jillion dollar budget. In this film, Burton is sure-handed and willing to be playful, and the film is the better for it. Imagine an army of penguins, each with its own remote-controlled, head-covering helmet. Imagine an office building with guns, art deco, moving cat faces poking out of the sides and top. The movie isn't deep; it's just great fun.

So what's wrong with Batman Returns? Well, the plot is muddled and tends to race all over the place, and I'm still unsure of many of the particular twists and turns the story took. (I can hear the Warner Bros. execs saying, "So go see it again!") The supposed depth of Catwoman as Batman's doppelganger (big fancy film term meaning "double") just isn't there. But go for the visuals, the wordplay and the humor. Batman Returns is simply a great time at the movies.

A lot happens in this Batman Returns — almost too much. Director Tim Burton and screenwriter Daniel Waters seem to be trying to make up for the slack pace of the first film. In geek terms, this means that if you took Batman and Batman Returns, added up the amount of action in them, and divided by two, each film would have a decent amount of action.

The most exciting part of the film is the addition of humor. Besides the already mentioned Penguin, Michael Keaton is given some opportunity to display his comic talents (and that's how he became a star in the first place, remember?) I won't give away any more of the film's lines, but he has some very funny moments, including a jab at a scene from the first Batman.

And finally, after five films, it can be said with confidence that Tim Burton is the most original visual director in commercial film-making today. Credit also goes to his production team, especially production designer Bo Welch, who designed the amazing sets. Many of his sets are enormous parodies of actual places, including a monstrous and perverse version of New York's Rockefeller Plaza. The set itself is an elaborate visual joke.

That's what makes this film better than the first. Burton and his gang seemed afraid to have fun with the first one, as if they were scared to do something as frivolous as have fun when making a movie with a bazillion-jillion dollar budget. In this film, Burton is sure-handed and willing to be playful, and the film is the better for it. Imagine an army of penguins, each with its own remote-controlled,
The United States equalized the military advantage at the Warsaw Pact. This is the first class of the post-Cold War, post-Soviet era. At the core of the nuclear rivalry with the Soviet Union was the occupied commencement speakers and graduating classes — more than the traditional Western powers and nuclear, and right on. It formed the centerpiece of national security. But you’re graduating into a new world order where nuclear threat has been radically altered. This new world crystallized last Christmas Day when Mikhail Gorbachev resigned as president of the USSR and the Soviet Union disintegrated. The disappearance of the Soviet Union has been hailed as a major geopolitical change but has not been without its costs. The post-Cold War era has witnessed a significant reorientation of power dynamics, particularly regarding nuclear weapons. In fact, a world without nuclear weapons would actually be better. The proposition is that the United States has relied on nuclear weapons for its security and influence, but this is not the unified threat nuclear policy.

In the United States, we are losing nuclear weapons to others in a major geopolitical arena that was once an unassailable military advantage. This is not to say that the nuclear threat has gone away. Nuclear weapons remain a potent force. But over time, we accommodate to the changing landscape. The United States is no longer a superpower in the conventional sense. The superpowers that threatened not only national survival but life on the planet itself have now disappeared. The world in which we find ourselves is vastly different from the one we knew.

The first proposition — and this is the heart of understanding the new nuclear reality — is that the nuclear threat has undergone a fundamental shift. Nuclear proliferation is a constant concern. Nuclear weapons are not just weapons of mass destruction, they are also a tool for statecraft. In the United States, we are losing nuclear weapons to others in a major geopolitical arena that was once an unassailable military advantage. This is not to say that the nuclear threat has gone away. Nuclear weapons remain a potent force. But over time, we accommodate to the changing landscape. The United States is no longer a superpower in the conventional sense. The superpowers that threatened not only national survival but life on the planet itself have now disappeared. The world in which we find ourselves is vastly different from the one we knew.
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