Editorial

MIT Writing: let's clear the air

We are disappointed at the actions taken by Chairman John Ross in response to the letter sent to him by a group of faculty members concerned with the future of the Writing Program at MIT.

We are further disappointed by the report written at Ross's request by Dean of the School of Humanities and Social Science Harold J. Hanham, which was printed in Tech Talk last week, and by the refusal of that publication to grant space for a reply by members of the Writing Program.

Hanham's statement contains nothing other than the arguments behind which the administration has long been hiding. The Writing Program members have further aggravated the situation by crying "foul" at every Administration's action. The Writing Program controversy will end only after open, honest discussions of the specific points of contention and of the larger issues involved. It is time to clear the air.

Thursday articles condemned

To the Editor:

I am ashamed at the complete and continued lack of professionalism exhibited every week in Thursday. I do not question Thursday's right to a free press, but I do question their misuse of that right. They have printed derogatory letters without even checking to see if the name appearing at the bottom is the person who actually wrote it. They have made fun of a very serious American Cancer Society public service advertisement. Most recently and certainly most of all, they have printed libelous statements of former members of the MIT community. These are not isolated cases. Thursday continually exhibits an unprofessional attitude. I think the MIT community has been patient enough. It is now time to act.

What can the MIT community do? I suggest the following actions. First, talk to the Deans, especially Dean of Students, the person who is in charge of student activities. Second, present a signed petition to the Student Senate (the funding committee of the UA) and to the Activities Development Board (funding committee under Dean Holden); in a way which has made impossible any significant public input into the decision-making process.

Nearly three weeks after Ross received the letter from nine faculty members and a supportive statement from five others, the Report of the Sivin Committee still has not been sent to the faculty; the report must be distributed immediately. Moreover, Ross has ignored the letter's suggestion that a faculty investigation be conducted. Instead, he has agreed only to discuss the writing program controversy at the regular faculty meeting on May 18, at best a token gesture. All of these actions have contributed to the growing feeling of friction and suspicion within the MIT community. The Writing Program controversy will end only after open, honest discussions of the specific points of contention and of the larger issues involved. It is time to clear the air.
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Hello, Muriel...

"Hello, Muriel! You wouldn't believe the day I've had. No, I'm not at the airport, I' m still at Cambridge. One man from the screening..."

"Like the ad said, I went looking for this guy Bruce Mazzullo. He's all part of the Harvard Business School staff. They number around 250..."