ON DISCRIMINATION

About two weeks ago the first broadsides were fired at dis-  

criminatory clauses in the constitutions and charters of Institute  

activities, organizations and living groups, by the News Direc-  

tor of WMIT Radio Station in his regular Friday review of  

campus news. After the publishing of two letters on the sub-  

ject in these pages, and several more broadcasts, a resolution  

was introduced in Instcomm asking for compulsory removal of  
such clauses within a duly specified limit of time.

That the resolution was not adopted did not come as a  

surprise. A delicate issue was raised, in the same way, a piece  
of porcelain by the proverbial bull in the china shop. With  

astonishing disregard for the many aspects involved in the  

case, a resolution was drawn up, and, only five days after  

the initial steps were taken, it was tossed on to the Inst-  

com floor.

Resolution as radical in scope and forceful in its wording  

as any other, the resolution has been adopted by Instcomm,  

and the approval of an alternative form was inevitable.

However, that is not all. The case did to the prestige of  

the Institute in general and to that of Instcomm in particular,  

irreparable damage. In the eyes of those who read the original  

resolution, aware that it did not take into account all sides of the  

problem, that it was dictatorial in trying to have groups report discrim-  
inatory clauses to Instcomm within ten days after the even  

of the resolution, that it was equally dictatorial in trying to  

have the offending clauses removed by coercion and within a  
time limit, and that a more thoroughly studied resolution  

presented in the place of the original would probably have  

been adopted where the original was bound to stumble.

So much for those that have had the opportunity of seeing  

the resolution and innovators who have not had that opportuni-  
ty—and there is many a man both in the Institute and outside who does not know the whole story  

only to oppose the resolution and the abolition of discriminatory clauses in fraternity char-  

ters, and in its stead passed what in comparison seems a half-  

hearted statement of intention.

By strong and indiscriminated publicity before the introduc-  
tion of the resolution in Instcomm, and by tactless remarks and ac-  

tions after its defeat there, its author brought the fact that dis-  
criminatory clauses exist within the Institute into glaring and useless  

prominence, and antagonized the very men who could be useful  
to the Institute.

At the same time, we both praise and reproach the very able  

president of Instcomm; praise him for the inimitable fairness  

with which he allowed the author of the resolution to have his  

say at the faculty meeting and reproach him for attempting to  

reconcile the author with the other members of the Executive  

Committee of Instcomm, for a certain lack of foresight in allowing the  

resolution to be introduced unrevised on the floor of Inst-  

comm.

We suggest that henceforth resolutions of basically contro-  

versial nature be submitted to a special committee of Instcomm  

members for discussion and possible revision, and that when  

such a resolution is adopted, the drafting of the resolution  

in parliament of vaster jurisdiction bills are gone through  

in parliaments of vaster jurisdiction bills are gone through  

by the author be done with the assistance of a legal counsel.

The controversional nature of that resolution was to the  

institute Committee was an attempt to "crack down" on the fraternities,  

and it was a constructive motion proposed by those of us who  

tried to finance the growth of the Institute as taught in our schools.  

It is regrettable that this motion was defeated, because by this action we  

have demonstrated our reluctance or inability to live up to the  

principles of democracy and brotherhood we are trying to spread  

throughout the world.

David Cooper '53

The controversial motion that was just recently defeated by Insti-  

tute Committee was not an attempt to "crack down" on the fraternities,  

but rather it was a constructive motion proposed by those of us who  

tried to finance the growth of the Institute as taught in our schools.  

It is regrettable that this motion was defeated, because by this action we  

have demonstrated our reluctance or inability to live up to the  

principles of democracy and brotherhood we are trying to spread  

throughout the world.

David Cooper '53