Commission to release main report in 2 months
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student as he moves through his
community just as other mixers
do for the MIT straight commu-
ity. SHL would abide all the
usual rules governing use of the
Student Center, he said. It mer-
ly wanted equal treatment.

In the discussion that fol-
lowed Tillotson remarked it was
proposed that SHL wait two
months in order to conduct a
large-scale educational campaign,
thus possibly satisfying the ad-
ministration. Other arguments
were put forward stating that MIT
should not set itself as a parental
authority over its students, and
argued the administration that it
would not interfere with students' lives as they were capa-
ble of taking rationality for themselves. As far as the
possibility of seduction went, it was argued that seduction took place at
heterosexual mixers.

At this point a motion to
table the motion was proposed
in order that the GA could try
to change the Administration's
opinion, rather than simply pass
the motion, which might be an
impermissible restriction. This was
voted down in a vote of 19 to 4,
and the committee was set up to
convince the Administration that
a GA ruling on the mixer. The
committee will also consider
possible restrictions on the mix-
ner which would satisfy the
Administration, and stated that
this would involve itself in.

After the meeting, Tillotson
commented that he was disap-
pointed with the tabling action
and annoyed that after the per-
sons who proposed the motion
spoke in favor of tabling, Robert's Rules of Order did not
permit further discussion on the
issue.

Other business in the meeting
included approving committee
nominations, lowering of the
quorum to one-third, passing an
amendment limiting to one the
number of Executive Committee
members from the same living
group, and passing a motion from
the floor defaming the UA with the
National Student Association
(NSA). In order to lower the
advantage of the services and the
expenses, a student over the NSA,
and to assist the NSA in infor-
mation and discipline, NSA was
a twenty-year old group representing students, colleges and
universities, with policies set by a vote of the student members,
and taken on the floor of the
NSA, such as their legal right, could be
done to help the UA. First year
member was $5, and with wider
action the GA might wish to
involve itself in.

All of these problems have
common one basic aim. They all
seek to release the potential of
faculty and students, here as
elsewhere, thought of university
governance (if they thought of
it at all) as something that was
inevitably the business of trus-
tees and administrators. Now,
with the present concern for the
right to be heard and the right
to participate in decision-
making, this makes it imperative
that the community as a whole
reconsider its basic constitution
and perhaps revise some of the
general rules regarding execu-
tive, legislative, and judicial as-
psects of governance.

“3. Current and anticipated
decides in the level of public
health problems also require
programs of research and grad-
uate education and research to
adjust in Institute practices and
planning. Shifts in national pri-
cities, changes in the patterns
of federal funding and (even)
permitting tax measures have com-
bined to place severe financial
strains on the university — strains which may make it diffi-
cult for the Institute to set its own goals or apply its research resources
in education . . . These measures will force the Institute to exer-
cise greater control over the
intention and continuation of
research projects, and greater
efforts will also be needed to
identify and cultivate alternate
sources of funding and support, as
well as private.

“4. The turmoil universities
know also may undermine it
imperative that we redefine
the rights and responsibilities of
the MIT community, and that we
provide greater opportunities for partici-
pation in the decision-making
processes that affect the charac-
ter and role of the Institute. Not
very long ago, the great majority of faculty and students, here as
elsewhere, thought of university
governance (if they thought of
it at all) as something that was
inevitably the business of trus-
tees and administrators. Now,
with the present concern for the
right to be heard and the right
to participate in decision-
making, this makes it imperative
that the community as a whole
reconsider its basic constitution
and perhaps revise some of the
general rules regarding execu-
tive, legislative, and judicial as-
psects of governance.
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