Letters to The Tech

To the Editor:
Dr. Ronald D. Rothchild was pretty upset that the Administration refused to let him hold their press conference. His statement that faculty members have demanded this space be provided. When MIT-SHL was denied this request, Rothchild, like most of us who were just as much an act of "political repression," as he claimed, issued a petition signed by a number of faculty members. His signatories include both MIT-SHL and ASG/SA. At the time (Fall 1970), we tried to show that this was largely an act of student control of the Student Center. When the Student Center Committee, the General Faculty Committee, and the New York Times called for a recognition of the student's demands, both student and faculty groups agreed that a recognized student group, the Student Center Advisory Committee, was the logical center of student facilities, then that ought to be enough. There should be no need for the Administration to get involved. We asked that all student groups interested in control over the Student Center be invited to meet with the Administration. We stated that this should be considered a student, not a faculty, issue. The Administration assured us that this would be the case.

The second question of fact is whether the student group was authorized by the student body. This is a critical question, for without proper student body authorization, the student group would be without a legitimate basis for being heard at all. The answer is that the student group was authorized. The original petition was signed by almost all of the student body. The student council of the student body of the student groups' specific objectives. The student council's statement was "The purpose of the Tech is to provide a medium for the expression of ideas and opinions. The Tech is published twice a week as a means of providing a forum for discussion of issues and events affecting the entire MIT community. The Tech is produced by the student body of the student group..."

In reference to Ronald D. Rothchild's letter of April 7, 1972, we will not address the question of the legality of his actions. It is imperative to try to determine for ourselves such things as "over" and "abuse," the nature of "power," and the true "spiritual" nature of our society. Most important is the extreme irrelevance of the editor of The Tech in publishing this kind of hate mail. We call this "the jihadism." In the world of the non-Arab, there are two questions of fact raised by Rothchild to which we will reply. The first question is whether the student group was authorized by the student body. The answer is that the student group was authorized. The original petition was signed by almost all of the student body. The student council of the student body of the student group's specific objectives. The student council's statement was "The purpose of the Tech is to provide a medium for the expression of ideas and opinions. The Tech is published twice a week as a means of providing a forum for discussion of issues and events affecting the entire MIT community. The Tech is produced by the student body of the student group..."
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