BSU discipline - two views:

By Wells Edleman

Racism, sexism and other conflicts of the basic issue in the Faculty Club dispute. There are several views of racial problems which all claim to be non-racist.

The Faculty Club view: racism is ended when discrimination loses its legal sanction. Any action by authority to combat existing racist attitudes, or the effects of past racism, is inappropriate.

A liberal view: Racism has not been combated, but institutional action can only be taken when it is acceptable (and doesn't threaten to upset the power of the white oligarchy). A significant feature of this view is the dictating to blacks on what they should do about racism.

A radical view: Individuals and institutions must recognize present and past racism, and deal with it. Right, not opportunity, must determine what actions are taken. It is not racist for blacks to have their own pride, identity, or institutions - it is racist to deny their rights.

Faculty Club dispute

In the Faculty Club dispute, the conflict is essentially between the liberal view of management and the radical view of the workers and their allies. The MIT Administration follows the liberal line, taking into account the complexities of the situation, but also using these complexities to rationalize a lack of direct action.

The worker's demands - equivalent pay retroactive to initial employment, discharge of Manager William Morrison, and preferential hiring and promotion for black workers - have been snarled in the tangled network of regulations (workers charge that their union, their legal representatives, remains unsympathetic; they are also wary of the arbitrating method and bureaucratic procedures). Even the management of the Faculty Club (and MIT) concede that these grievances have taken a long time in the "process of resolution." It was within this context that a non-violent, non-obstructive sit-in was held at the Faculty Club by the BSU on November 14.

Conflict of rights

The sit-in raised a conflict of rights: on the one side, the right of people to attend a "Wild West" party at the Club; on the other, the right of the workers to a fast settlement of their demands. To the editor:

Visiting Committee

The Committee has decided to re-examine the procedures of the Lewis Commission and its report. The original purpose of the Committee was to recommend procedures for determining the facts of the BSU sit-in and then to recommend a course of action for the BSU.

The Committee does not have time to hear all of the evidence of the system. The report of last year's Committee contained about 500 pages of student input. It will shortly be presented to the Corporation, mainly as an information source of student opinion. By itself, the report cannot be taken as the truth, but it can lead to changes when connected with thorough hearings, such as the advisory system. It was a kind of study of our students by students.

The Committee would like to have student input on the advisory system. If anyone has something to say, he should write a letter to me or to the whole Committee. That is how you can have input, if you care enough.

As a newly elected Corporation member (and an MIT graduate student last year), I would welcome letters from any member of the MIT community.

Ralph M. Davison

Visiting Committee

The Lewis Commission, in the other hand, has a different purpose. It was established for the express purpose of determining whether the events it had that "met during the period of my administration," is "that of C". The statement was not one of the "Constitution and By-Laws of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology," which defines the rights of MIT students. The statement was not one of the "Constitution and By-Laws of MIT," which defines the rights of MIT students. The statement was not one of the "Constitution and By-Laws of MIT," which defines the rights of MIT students.

Letters to The Tech

To the editor:

I am disappointed by Harold Federer's article concerning the Visiting Student Committee (The Tech, November 15). His criticism relating to the limited number of students present is not justified. The Committee has decided to revise the entire advisory system. A study has been made up of the praise and criticism of the individual students. The blind men describing the elephant by feel. As it was we did not have time to hear all of the reports on the many aspects of the system.

The report of last year's Committee contained about 500 pages of student input. It will shortly be presented to the Corporation, mainly as an information source of student opinion. By itself, the report cannot be taken as the truth, but it can lead to changes when connected with thorough hearings, such as the advisory system. It was a kind of study of our students by students.

The Committee would like to have student input on the advisory system. If anyone has something to say, he should write a letter to me or to the whole Committee. That is how you can have input, if you care enough.

As a newly elected Corporation member (and an MIT graduate student last year), I would welcome letters from any member of the MIT community. The Committee will try to answer all that I receive.

Ralph M. Davison

Visiting Committee

Student Affairs

by Brent Parker and Johnny Hickey

lewis commission vs. lewis

Contrast in perspective

By Les Giguere

The MIT Commission worked from a very different viewpoint than that of the Lewis Commission of twenty years ago, emphasizing a contemporary "crisis" in education rather than the historical perspective taken by the Lewis Commission.

In the forward to their report, the Lewis Commission states, "The committee was instructed to re-examine the principles of education that had served as a guiding policy at MIT for almost ninety years, and to determine whether they are applicable to the conditions of a new era...." The MIT Commission, ox the other hand, was a product of a period of"short-28s,

Recent developments: Lewis vs. Commission

The necessity for new guidelines in the wake of the "development of the "Black Student Union Plan," combined with the end of William Rogers' tenure and the appointment of Dr. Jerome Wiesner as the new president of MIT. This is the reason for the Lewis Commission's decision to examine the historical perspective of the MIT community and to determine whether the principles of education at MIT are still applicable to the current situation.

The MIT Commission was established in March 1974 to consider the issues raised in the "Black Student Union Plan" and to provide recommendations for the future of MIT.

The Commission was composed of eight members, including representatives from the student body, faculty, administration, and alumni. The Commission was given the task of examining the historical development of MIT and determining whether the principles of education at MIT are still applicable to the current situation.

The Commission's report, titled "In Undergraduate Education," was presented to the MIT community in September 1976. The report outlined a series of recommendations for the future of MIT, including the establishment of a new campus in Boston, the creation of a new college of engineering, and the development of a new curriculum.

The report was met with mixed reactions from the MIT community. Some members of the MIT community welcomed the report's recommendations, while others were critical of the Commission's approach and conclusions.

The report was also met with criticism by some members of the wider Boston community. Some members of the Boston community were concerned about the implications of the report for the future of MIT, while others were critical of the Commission's approach and conclusions.
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