By Les Giguerre

The Discipline Committee hearings which began last night approach being an exercise in futility. None of the students charged will actually be disciplined — they have already faced criminal charges, anyway — since they do not recognize the moral right of their accusers to proceed with them. The administration, which is bringing the complaints against the ROTC occupiers as it said it would last year, would appear to be pursuing the matter to preserve its credibility.

For the student and faculty community at MIT, the hearings offer little hope of any lasting benefit. Rather, they will raise the divisive issues of the war and war research at MIT in a format which will blur them with MIT's own problems in setting straight its judicial system.

Virtually everyone, from students and faculty and students who would seem to have so little to gain from the hearings who are in reality responsible for them. For the Discipline Committee is a standing committee of the Faculty and therefore derives its authority from, and is responsible to, the Faculty, and to the students with whom it shares its responsibility.

Some questions

Two and a half years ago, in the period immediately following Mike Albert's resignation, the student-faculty working group on the GAL's judicial system presented a report which was endorsed by the GA. However, the Nominations Committee has been operating quite independently for a long time, and since the GA has ceased functioning, has been working in a virtual vacuum.

This, coupled with general student disinterest in working on faculty matters, has made someon's work very difficult — often, the job has been a matter of finding someone to take the post rather than choosing among a number of qualified candidates. When it became apparent, rather less than two years ago, that the Discipline hearings were imminent, Nomcom Chairman Bob Longair '73 failed to secure a quorum and, in accordance with the GA's rules, hearings for the student occupiers on the Discipline Committee. Although Nomcom did manage to fill the openings, the legitimacy of its nominees as the representatives of the undergraduate student body remains open to serious question.

Given all these questions — the legitimacy of the student members of the committee, the legitimacy of the charges being brought against the ROTC occupiers, and the legitimacy of the system itself — one is tempted to ask why the hearings are being held at all. Is there really a need for urgency in "resolving" the matter in this way? Is there not another solution?

Alternatives

In fact, of course, there are other alternatives open to MIT. The first and most obvious is that the administration has already had recourse to criminal complaints. Another alternative, and one which will be a matter of public interest in the future, would be to simply allow the cases to drop. Two years ago, when the Faculty was considering the chances of two of its members for allowed participation in the occupation at the Tech, it was simply allowed the matter to die.

Instead, we are faced with a series of long, time-consuming and divisive hearings which are likely to increase tensions upon which little benefit, in this observer's opinion, will accrue to the community.

The defaults, in the case that we have already tried once, have never been appealing. None of the actions. Even the law does not allow a person to be tried twice for the same crime.

It seems that MIT might be able to use this moment to show society that there are other ways of dealing with political cause with this charge, that is not necessary to extract payment from those who seek to assert their moral values against those of the institutions of government, and that the law does not allow a person to be tried twice for the same crime.

The question, also, is this: How much more will we have to pay for Vietnam? It seems pointless to go on.
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Letters to The Tech

Hanshan

To the editor:

September 19 issue of The Tech quoted Dr. Hanshan, the new dean of MIT's School of Humanities and Social Sciences. As Dr. Hanshan is interested in liberal arts should go to some other university.

Dr. Hanshan said, "If a person has the humanistic side should come to MITo

in full time should go to some other university.

In addition to the above, he also said that the student-faculty working group on the GAL's judicial system has been working quite independently for a long time, and since the GA has ceased functioning, has been working in a virtual vacuum.

This, coupled with general student disinterest in working on faculty matters, has made someon's work very difficult — often, the job has been a matter of finding someone to take the post rather than choosing among a number of qualified candidates. When it became apparent, rather less than two years ago, that the Discipline hearings were imminent, Nomcom Chairman Bob Longair '73 failed to secure a quorum and, in accordance with the GA's rules, hearings for the student occupiers on the Discipline Committee. Although Nomcom did manage to fill the openings, the legitimacy of its nominees as the representatives of the undergraduate student body remains open to serious question.

Given all these questions — the legitimacy of the student members of the committee, the legitimacy of the charges being brought against the ROTC occupiers, and the legitimacy of the system itself — one is tempted to ask why the hearings are being held at all. Is there really a need for urgency in "resolving" the matter in this way? Is there not another solution?

Alternatives

In fact, of course, there are other alternatives open to MIT. The first and most obvious is that the administration has already had recourse to criminal complaints. Another alternative, and one which will be a matter of public interest in the future, would be to simply allow the cases to drop. Two years ago, when the Faculty was considering the chances of two of its members for allowed participation in the occupation at the Tech, it was simply allowed the matter to die.

Instead, we are faced with a series of long, time-consuming and divisive hearings which are likely to increase tensions upon which little benefit, in this observer's opinion, will accrue to the community.

The defaults, in the case that we have already tried once, have never been appealing. None of the actions. Even the law does not allow a person to be tried twice for the same crime.

It seems that MIT might be able to use this moment to show society that there are other ways of dealing with political cause with this charge, that is not necessary to extract payment from those who seek to assert their moral values against those of the institutions of government, and that the law does not allow a person to be tried twice for the same crime.

The question, also, is this: How much more will we have to pay for Vietnam? It seems pointless to go on.