In a letter appearing below, an MIT student expresses his distress that the Fair Play for Cuba organization was given permission by the Activities Council to make use of the MIT bulletin boards. The writer goes on to criticize The Tech for not voting against such permission. He holds that because most of the MIT student body does not "agree" with this organization, it should be denied the status of a Class B activity.

The right to use the MIT name and publicity facilities is a privilege, but is it a privilege to be granted according to the popularity of the idea? Obviously, if everyone agreed with the Fair Play for Cuba group, it would have no reason for existing. Its ideas are unpopular; The Tech assuredly does not like Dr. Castro and does not "agree" with him. But there is certainly no reason to suppress a group trying to get a hearing for Castro's side of the question. Or is the writer concerned that the position of the United States with respect to Cuba is so weak that dissent must be stifled?

We do not think this is a problem. The attention of The Tech on this issue was a reflection of its disapproval of Dr. Castro, and of its doubts as to whether the group would actually exist more than a few months. Whether there should be a class of activity permitted to use the bulletin boards but not the MIT name is a question that must be settled soon. We are likely to see more ad hoc political groups in the future, and a policy toward them should be set.

If this is not done, every group will become a political football for Activity Council. The test for approval of a group should not be the popularity of its ideas, but only that it be made up of MIT students with a responsible aim. Otherwise all religious groups, all political groups, and all publications that represent minority opinion would be on the bulletin boards with the right to use the MIT name, since in a sense, the bulk of the student body does not "agree" with them.
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