Homosexual Mixer

Tonight the General Assembly will receive a report from its own study group recommending that the Student Homophile League be granted permission to hold a mixer at MIT. The Tech first reported on this issue two weeks ago; we feel that the delegates have had ample time to poll their living groups and prepare for a vote.

There are two closely related aspects of the problem: the fact that the mixer must be changed, which makes the student administration decide what the mixer should be. Second, the criterion for the decision must be established, and the decision made.

We believe that ultimate authority for this issue should rest with the undergraduate government. Clearly, the faculty and staff need not concern themselves with such a problem involving students. The college seems to center on what role the administration should play.

Dean for Student Affairs Dan Nyhart has argued that, because of the moral and legal issues involved, his office should have a veto over the mixer. But his comments, both to the Tech and the Assembly, indicate that his over-riding concern is protecting the welfare of MIT students, both living groups and preparing for a vote.

As for the decision itself, The Tech suggests that SHL be allowed to run a mixer. Just as with other mixers, of course, precautions should be taken to see that MIT does not suffer any physical damage. The mixer must be carefully marked, so that all students will understand what is happening. We urge the SHL to establish a screening procedure to ensure that only students are admitted. Finally, the Assembly must leave the Student Center Committee the flexibility to schedule the mixer with an eye to what space is available and what other (possibly more numerous) student groups desire for the facility.

We would close by reconsidering a crucial point. This issue concerns the students far more than any other group in the community. If Boston University can hold a gay mixer without bringing down the wrath of the city fathers and the local media, MIT runs no risks. The student government must be allowed to decide this issue.

Policy Statement

Over the summer The Tech's editorial board changed its membership, and the new board felt that, at the start of the term, it was an appropriate time for a statement of policy.

Our primary goal is to provide accurate and unbiased news coverage of events at MIT and in the surrounding community. The editors devote a large fraction of their time to arranging news stories, feature articles, sports coverage, and entertainment. We pride ourselves for continually emphasizing the value to the community of an objective news presentation.

On student government

By Steve Ehrmann

(Ed. Note: Ehrmann is vice president of the MIT undergraduate government.)

The predominant emotion pervading student government these days is frustration. A calcitrant administration? A pervading student government (Ed. Note: this is not the context of the article, that it obviously out of place in the article, that is se, and peace course compounds the problem),

4. Committee on MIT Responsible governance and GA meeting. If confirmed as task force, will examine issues of MIT's corporate responsibility to society. Three members.

5. Communications Board - heart of the government. Charged to be in touch with doings of all student, faculty, and administrative committees. Ideal vehicle to help MIT function.

6. Christmas Convocation - the only event of the year that is protecting the welfare of MIT students, both living groups and preparing for a vote.

Secondly, The Tech provides a forum for student opinion. Editorial policy through the coming year will be the consensus of views among the news editors and the editor-in-chief. When too large a division exists to permit a consensus, individual board members will write signed columns discussing their views. The Tech welcomes written contributions from all members of the community. Works from students will be run as either letters or columns, while all other articles will be run as letters to the editor.

Letters to The Tech

COMPLAINTS DEPT.

To the Editor of The Tech:

In his article about Karen Barston's speech, Harvey Baker found it necessary to mention that Miss Barston wore "a brown pant suit and peace symbol necklace." I wonder why. This is rarely found in articles about speeches by male Congressional candidates.

This is just one more confirmation of the fact that men are unable to look at women without seeing sex first and everything else second, including the a:rticular characteristic which is imposed at the moment. More notably, what women wear (women do too, and this of course compounds the problem), and rarely listen to what they have to say. I must admit that the writer seems to have listened to at least superficially to the speaker, which is a step in the right direction. But one small descriptive phrase was obviously out of place in the context of the article, that it could not fail to escape the notice of...